

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1882.

ART. I.—THE MISSION OF THE ZAMBESI.

1. *Mission of the Zambesi.* By the Rev. A. WELD, S.J. London: 1879.
2. *Die Katholische Kirche und die Kaffern.* By the Right Rev. JAMES DAVID RICARDS, Vicar-Apostolic of the Eastern Vicariate of Cape Colony. Augsburg: 1879.
3. *How I Crossed Africa.* By Major SERPA PINTO. London: 1881.
4. *Seven Years in South Africa.* By Dr. EMIL HOLUB. London: 1881.
5. *Matabele Land and the Victoria Falls.* By FRANK OATES, F.R.G.S. London: 1881.
6. *Les Missions Catholiques.* Lyons.

40
WHILE the French and Italian missionaries are heading the crusade against infidelity in Central and Equatorial Africa, the Jesuit Fathers, ever found in the foremost ranks of the chivalry of charity, have undertaken the evangelization of the vast district lying between Lake Bangweolo and the northern boundary of the new Dutch State of the Transvaal. This mission has a peculiar claim on the sympathies of the people of this country, for it is directed by the English Province of the Society, its base of operations is the British territory in South Africa, and one of its first martyrs was an Englishman, Father Law, who died in November, 1880, of the fatigues and hardships his missionary zeal led him to undertake.

The geography of Africa is on a scale so stupendous as to bewilder the imagination, and each of the ecclesiastical districts into which the great heathen continent is mapped out for the

future conquests of the Gospel would embrace the area of several European kingdoms. The country assigned to the Jesuit Mission, extending from the Crocodile River on the Transvaal frontier to the tenth degree of south latitude, and from within a narrow distance of the East Coast, to the twenty-second meridian of east longitude, embraces the enormous area of 900,000 English square miles; and Linyanti, one of its principal future centres, is 1,200 miles, as a bird flies, from its base of supplies at Grahamstown, in the Cape Colony. This region contains the powerful kingdom of the Zambesi, as well as four hundred miles of unexplored country to the north of that river; the lands of the fierce Zulu tribes, the Matabele and the Abagasi; the great Kalahari Desert, the South African Sahara; the semi-civilized kingdom of the Eastern Bamangwatos, with its Christian ruler, Khame, and other scattered tribes innumerable.

The Zambesi district is, however, the objective point of the mission, and to reach it two routes seem to present themselves, either shorter in point of linear distance than the one actually chosen. The most obvious of these is the one from the mouth of the great river itself, following its course upward through Portuguese territory to the interior; the other, that from Zanzibar, in a south-easterly direction, passing by Lake Nyassa, and thence to the Zambesi. But the difficulties of transit on these routes are such as to counterbalance the diminution of distance; the first is rendered impracticable by the rapids barring the navigation of the river, and the absence of all other mode of communication; while the embarrassments of travellers dependent on Zanzibar carriers, in a country where the prevalence of tsetse fly precludes the use of animals of draught or burden, are a sufficient argument against the selection of the second.

The greater length of the southern route from Grahamstown, in the British dominions, is compensated for by preponderating advantages. In the first place, the road, keeping on the ridge of the continent which parts the streams flowing east and west, passes through a healthy country, exempt from the fevers of the coast. Secondly, its freedom from tsetse admits of the use of ox-waggons, thus obviating one of the principal difficulties of African travelling, that of transport. Thirdly, it offers facilities for keeping up communications with the civilized world, by establishing intermediate stations among friendly tribes, which the unsettled state of the country in other directions renders impossible.

Commercial enterprise has opened up the regions of South Central Africa, and the country lying between the Zambesi and the boundaries of British territory is no longer a trackless desert. Sir Bartle Frere, in a paper read before the Royal Geographical

Society, in November, 1880, gave an interesting sketch of the course of trade in these wild countries, where its votaries are all unconsciously preparing a highway for the Gospel. The ox-waggon is the ship of South Africa, and numbers of these vehicles are equipped and chartered for distant expeditions, just as fleets of merchantmen are for long sea-voyages. One firm employs as many as sixty, each drawn by from twelve to sixteen oxen, and with a large staff of men—one or two Europeans, and forty or fifty native huntsmen—attached to it. It thus forms a separate unit, and the chief trader in command of it has absolute discretion as to its movements. He selects his district in the great hunting-grounds of Damara Land, and there ranges at will, giving chase to the elephant, the antelope, and all the varieties of velvet-coated creatures that roam those once unbroken solitudes. The waggon, unlike the ship, is self-subsisting; the oxen graze by the way; the hunters not only live, but clothe themselves by the produce of their rifles, a little flour and Indian meal being their only other store; and thus, as long as the stout timbers of their vessel on wheels hold together, the party is independent of the outer world. They sometimes remain out in this way for two or three years, purchasing from the natives, in addition to the trophies of their own guns, ivory, ostrich feathers, and karosses—rugs made of skins neatly joined together. The full load of the waggon is about four tons, and with this quantity of goods it returns to its starting-point to discharge its cargo and pay off its crew. The capital employed in this trade is very extensive, and one Swedish firm is said to turn over annually £200,000.

The traders to the Zambesi basin generally start in winter (from April to September), returning in summer with their goods. These they generally dispose of to dealers established in the highlands of the Transvaal. The store of one of these merchants is a perfect emporium, where the products of civilization and the spoils of the desert jostle each other on the same shelf; and upright pianos and French millinery are displayed side by side with ivory tusks, ostrich feathers, giraffe or zebra hides, and rhinoceros horns. It is this great development of commercial activity which has rendered the establishment of a mission to the north of British territory a feasible enterprise; for here, as elsewhere, the trader has been the pioneer of the Gospel.

The British possessions in South Africa occupy a position in relation to the savage nations beyond similar to that of the French territories in the north; and Bishop Ricards, the Vicar-Apostolic of the eastern district of the Cape Colony, seems to have the same sense of responsibility as Mgr. Lavigerie in Algeria, in reference to the great continent lying beyond his proper sphere of labour.

He is working ardently for the conversion of the Kafirs, and has planted a Trappist monastery near Dortrecht, in the valley of the Sunday River, to found a model farm for the improvement of the natives in agriculture. He proposes to do the same in the country of the Tamboukie Kafirs, who have been petitioning the Government for instruction in farming. The monks destined for these colonies were sent out from the convent of Marienstern, in Bosnia, and the first is already established on a fertile piece of land, with an area of twelve square miles, purchased for them by the bishop.

Up to this, the spiritual necessities of the white population have claimed all the energies of the clergy, whose numbers are insufficient even for their own flocks. In addition to eleven Government stations, the vicariate of Bishop Ricards has twenty out-stations, visited only occasionally by priests, who have sometimes to ride a distance of 100 miles to attend a death-bed. Under these circumstances, and in view of the vast field of missionary enterprise as yet unopened in South Africa, the Vicar-Apostolic was anxious for the establishment of Jesuit Fathers in his district; and on his visit to Rome, in 1875, he made arrangements for the foundation of St. Aidan's College, in Grahamstown, the starting-point of the present mission. The attention of the Society was thus directed to South Africa; and shortly after, the idea of a missionary enterprise to the distant regions beyond civilization began to take shape and form. It was not, however, till 1877 that matters were ripe for the execution of the project; nor till the very end of that year that it received the sanction of the Propaganda. Father Depelchin was appointed the leader of the expedition, and his companions were ten in number—Fathers Law, Terörde, Blanca, Croonenberghs, and Fuchs, and Brothers Nigg, Paravicini, Hedley, de Vylder, and de Sadeleer. They sailed from England in January, 1879, and their voyage was signalized by an interesting occurrence. The *Durban*, having the Fathers on board, met with an accident to her machinery, which compelled her to make for Ascension, and there, during their ten days' involuntary sojourn, Father Fuchs was able to receive into the Church an English Freemason, who, having been converted by his Catholic wife, had been waiting three years for a priest.

Father Law was already at Grahamstown, devoting himself to the study of the Zulu language, and to practising the concertina and flageolet, in the belief that

Music hath charms to soothe the savage breast.

All the arts were enlisted in the cause of religion, for a zealous convert was meantime busy at a painting of the Crucifixion, in which, by introducing Zulus among those present, a spiritual and

moral truth was conveyed, by an allowable sacrifice of historical accuracy.

The recent outbreak of the war in Zululand, and the disaster to the English forces of January 22, seemed at this time to menace the safety of the routes to the interior; but it was finally decided not to delay the starting of the mission on this account, and preparations for its departure went on actively through the spring.

The missionary caravan was organized exactly on the model of trading expeditions to the interior. Three "tent-waggons" were purchased, in which the travellers were to live during the succeeding months, the body of the vehicle being loaded with luggage, and the whole covered with a canvas roof. Each of these waggons, requiring from twelve to eighteen oxen for its team, was supposed to accommodate three passengers, and to carry two and a half tons of dead weight in addition. To these was added a "buck-waggon," intended for goods alone, of a heavier and stouter build, and equal to a load of four tons. Fifty-eight oxen were purchased, guides and drivers engaged, a stock of provisions for six months laid in, and goods procured for barter with the natives along the way. The price of the waggons is from £120 to £150, the cattle cost about £10 a head, and the wages of the drivers and attendants required for each conveyance, during a five months' journey, amount to from £40 to £50. The waggon-load of trading goods, equivalent to the expenses of the expedition along the road, represents a capital of some £700, so that the cost of each waggon, fully stocked and equipped for the journey, is generally put down at £1,000. The expenses of travelling may be diminished by successful hunting along the way, as, in addition to the economy of food practised by living on the produce of the rifle, the skins of the animals shot have a considerable commercial value. Mortality among the draught animals, on the other hand, may add heavily to the traveller's bill, and much delay and impede his journey.

The day previous to the starting of the expedition, April 15, was celebrated as a solemn feast by all the Catholic inhabitants of Grahamstown, and the little church was crowded during the High Mass, sung by Father Depelchin, in presence of the Bishop. In the evening the ceremony of blessing the caravan took place. It was performed by the bishop and witnessed by a large crowd of spectators. The following afternoon the travellers set out on their adventurous journey, to tempt the perils of the wilds, with the waggons as their moving homes for many months to come. Fourteen oxen were yoked to each of the tent-waggons, while the heavy buck-wagon required a team of sixteen. Each conveyance was placed under the protection of a saint of the society, and bore

his name, proceeding as follows:—the “Claver,” the “De Britto,” the “Xavier,” and the “Loyola.” The order of march was principally regulated with reference to the necessities of the animals, on whose well-being the expedition was dependent for its success. As they do not feed by night, they require a certain amount of rest during the day, and the hours of march were as follows. At four o'clock P.M. the oxen were inspanned and the caravan got under weigh, travelling till about nine or ten, when it stopped for the night, a fire being lit and supper prepared. The oxen, however, were not generally outspanned at night, but lay down to sleep in rows as they stood. Between two and three A.M. another start was made, and the march continued till sunrise, when a fresh halt was called, all the Fathers said Mass, and breakfast followed. From sunrise till four in the afternoon the caravan remained stationary, the only break during these hours being dinner about two P.M. From ten to fifteen miles a day were thus covered, and the travellers completed the first stage of the journey, four hundred English miles, between April 16 and May 12.

Some description of the first day's journey, says Father Weld, in his interesting *brochure*, sold for the benefit of the mission, will give an idea of country at the outset. “At half-past-seven,” writes Father Terörde, “the waggons were brought together, and the oxen outspanned, to feed in the best of pastures. On our left was a large farm, serving at the same time for hotel and post-office. On our right was the bed of a stream, with a slender thread of water, on the opposite bank of which rose a hill a thousand feet in height. Within half an hour three altars were erected at the foot of this hill, and in this solitude of Nature three priests offered the Holy Mass. Turtle-doves and other birds composed the choir.” After leaving the neighbourhood of the farm, they again found themselves alone with the beauties of Nature. The scenery was grand, but the solitude extreme. There was not a house, not a hut, not a human being; nothing but birds—countless birds—gave life to the scene. Cactus, mimosa, and the wolf's milk tree clothed the slopes, and under their shade thousands of the most beautiful flowers and grasses were blooming. The wild geranium was conspicuous for its beauty; but what seems to be a characteristic of South Africa, not a tree, not a twig was without its thorns. During the following night the waggons passed the ridge of hills leading up to the first plateau, in circumstances which the travellers would not easily forget. The significant name of Helleport, given to the pass by the old Dutch settlers, suggests an idea of the difficulty of the passage for heavily laden waggons. It is not surprising then that one waggon became imbedded in the mire, so as to require all resources at hand to extricate it; and, to add to their difficulty, a violent storm of thunder and lightning, which had been long gathering, broke on them while still in the most dangerous portion of the pass. The

reader may conceive the situation—the fury of the storm, the shouts of the Kafirs; the darkness of the night, broken only by the lightning; the torrents of rain; and all this with a waggon imbedded on the brink of a yawning abyss, showed these inexperienced travellers something of the dangers they had undertaken to encounter. “It was too dangerous,” writes one of them, “to remain in the waggons, and scarcely less so to venture on foot.” We rejoiced when the lightning came, as it showed us where we could place our feet with safety.

The great danger of a thunderstorm in South African travel is an explosion, from the lightning igniting the store of powder always carried in one of the waggons, and blowing up the whole caravan.

On the following day the great Fish River was crossed, and the track led up its course for five days, through an almost uninhabited country, to a little place of five houses, called Gaba, being the largest settlement passed during the first fifty miles. They then entered the great gorge which the river has cut for itself through the central range of mountains. The scenery here seems to have been magnificent—

Enormous masses of rock, piled one upon another, rise up to the height of several thousand feet above the road, whilst the slender stream flows in a deep chasm a hundred feet below it. It is such gorges as this, or kloofs, as the Dutch colonists called them, that are supposed to have drained off the waters of the great interior lakes, whose basins form the karoos, or barren plains of which I have spoken.

After passing the little town of Cradock, nearly three thousand feet above the level of the sea, a succession of dreary, barren plains was passed, with little water, and no vegetation, save parched and scanty grasses. In this district the farms of the Dutch settlers, established in spots where the presence of a well or stream renders cultivation possible, are veritable oases in the desert. Fruits of every climate grow there in profusion, great herds of sheep and cattle pasture in the neighbourhood, and a more novel sight is furnished by flocks of ostriches, reared in a state of domestication. In one halting-place the Fathers were disturbed while saying Mass by a visit from some of these inquisitive creatures, who came poking their long necks about the altar in a most distracting fashion. The names of the settlements throughout this region, such as Adam’s-fontein, Mar’s-fontein, &c., indicate that only the exceptional existence of water at those places renders them fit for habitation.

This district was left behind when the Orange River was crossed—somewhat of an undertaking—as it is described as being about the width of the Rhine at Cologne, and some three feet deep.

As this is one of the principal fords of the river over which the traffic between the colony and the interior is carried, there are few spots at which the characteristic features of African travel can be seen to more advantage. It frequently happens that a hundred of these huge waggons pass the river here in a single day, laden with wool, hides, and ivory, for the coast, or European goods for the interior. At the time the missionaries reached the ford, there were twenty-five other waggons waiting for their turn to pass. It is difficult to form a true conception of the scene: the assembling of so many of these huge vehicles, each with its team of from fourteen to eighteen oxen; the wild-looking Kafirs, representing all the types of South Africa, with their repulsive features, their broad hats, and strangely-clad forms; the bellowing of five hundred or more oxen, the cries of the drivers, the cracking of the gigantic whips; and all amidst the placid beauty of a fine river, gently flowing between banks clothed with the richest foliage, must have left an impression on the memory not soon to be effaced. But all this will soon pass, for civilization is invading the land. A large iron bridge is now in course of construction, and travellers will shortly be whirled over the river with as little emotion as over the Thames at Richmond.

Fords are one of the principal difficulties of such a journey as this, and that of the Modder, a tributary of the Vaal, was shortly after near cutting off the travellers from their supper. A large waggon which had preceded them, was mired in the middle of the stream, thus completely blocking the passage, as the beasts, despite the stamping and yelling of the Kafirs, had lain sullenly down in the mud. As it was ten o'clock at night, and it had been arranged to have the evening meal at the other side, the impatience of the tired and hungry travellers may be imagined by the reader.

This warned us [writes one of the party] to search for a more practicable ford, which Brother Nigg, mounted on a black Basuto, now proceeded to do. He soon found a passage, and crossed over, bearing in one hand a coffee-pot, in the other a stick of dry wood. He was speedily followed by Brother de Sadeleer, on another Basuto, with a load of bread and bacon. These trial trips consumed an hour. Then our four equipages, like a flying battery, entered the stream at a gallop, crossed without obstacle, and ascended the further bank in full view of our unfortunate friends fast mired in the stream. Our fifty-eight oxen galloped like so many chargers to bring our artillery into line again.

Supper now followed in due course; nor were their hapless fellow travellers forgotten, for an additional span of oxen sent to their assistance, eventually rescued them from their uncomfortable position, though not without first breaking the chains of the waggon.

It may easily be imagined that this gipsy life, despite its

picturesqueness of surroundings, and variety of incidents, is not without its drawbacks. The cold on these high plateaus is often intense, and Father Terörde writes, that he never suffered so much from cold while saying Mass, as during this journey. The jolting of the waggon during many hours of the night renders sleep unrefreshing, and the discomforts of a long march in rain and storm, with perhaps no possibility of lighting a fire at the end of it, may be left to the imagination. If the hunters are unskilful, and the chase unproductive, food is reduced to a minimum, and the travellers record with pleasure how, on one of these dismal occasions, a Protestant farmer, whose daughter was at the convent of Grahamstown, and had there met one of the party, came five miles to meet them, taking them bread, fresh meat and milk. Indeed, the kindness they met with from all classes during their journey must have cheered them through many of its hardships. At Cradock, where they ministered to a little forlorn congregation of thirty Catholics, the room which they fitted up as a chapel for the occasion was lent them by a Protestant, who volunteered to offer it.

At Kimberley, where a town of 25,000 inhabitants has been improvised beside the great diamond mine, the Catholic population, nearly a thousand strong, hailed the arrival of the Fathers with unbounded enthusiasm. Donations of all kinds poured in on them, from Martini cartridges and broad brimmed hats, to stores of provisions for their journey. An impromptu collection, after a sermon by Father Law, produced £30; and on the eve of the departure of the expedition, a deputation of Catholics waited on the missionaries to present them with an address and a purse of £100.

Leaving Kimberley on the 21st of May, the caravan passed through a country where towns and settlements were few and far between, and traces of civilization had almost disappeared. The march was consequently varied only by the ordinary incidents of such a journey. On one occasion, indeed, the expedition was for a moment threatened by a serious danger. At midnight, when the camp was hushed in silence, the terrible cry of "fire," was heard from one of the Kafirs, and the Fathers, springing from their waggons, discovered that a box slung under one of them was already in flames. Happily, it was detached in time to prevent the conflagration from spreading, for the waggon above it contained a barrel of gunpowder—sufficient to have blown its whole contents into the air. A similar catastrophe actually occurred to a Mr. Burgess, while hunting in the Zambesi country—a spark from his pipe having caused an explosion, in which he himself, his waggon, horses, and oxen were destroyed.

On the 19th of June, Zeerust was reached, a little town beauti-

fully situated in the fertile valley of the Marico, whose orange gardens and luxuriant vegetation suggested the landscape of southern Italy. Here the streams were flowing north, towards the Limpopo, or Crocodile River, showing that the water-shed between it and the Orange River had been crossed. The Marico was forded near its junction with the Limpopo, where it was at this—the dry season—only sixty yards across, though during the rains it is nearly four times as wide. The necessity of taking the numerous fords at their lowest, prescribes the dry season as the time for travelling in South Africa; and the sudden rise of a river often causes a delay of many days on a journey. The quantity of water in the rivers varies very much with the seasons; and some, called *Spruits*, have only an intermittent current, their beds being occupied during the dry months by a series of detached pools. On July 17, they had, in passing the Notuane, another difficult ford, requiring double spans to the waggons. Three days later they crossed the tropic, and entered within the limits of their mission. A large cross was rudely cut in the bark of a tree, to mark the spot where the first Mass was said, and Father Law contributed an interesting sketch of the scene to *Les Missions Catholiques*.

They were now close to the territory of the Eastern Bamanquato, the most powerful of the Bechuana tribes. It is particularly interesting, as affording an example of an African community under the dominion of a Christian ruler; for Khame, its king, was an early convert of the Wesleyan missionaries, and has remained since his boyhood steadfast to his faith. He has even borne a certain amount of persecution for it, in refusing to submit to the rite of circumcision, which is customary in his tribe, and which his father, Sekhome, wished to compel him to undergo. He is a rare combination of gentleness and strength of character; for while his rule over his subjects is mild and beneficent, he is stern in his suppression of wrong-doing. The importation of spirits into his dominions is absolutely forbidden under his government, and no evasion of the law is permitted. Dr. Holub, in his interesting work, "Seven Years in South Africa," narrates the adventures of a trader in whose company he travelled, who had smuggled a quantity of brandy into the Bamanquato territory, and who, on his misdeed being discovered by the king, was arrested and fined £100. Two other traders on the same occasion were sentenced to pay £10 each, as a penalty for having been publicly seen in a state of intoxication, Khame, declaring that, if they chose to commit such excesses, they might do so within their own quarters, but he would not have his subjects demoralized by their example.

He encourages habits of industry among his people, visiting

the houses of rich and poor alike, and urging them to work. The result is, that in addition to making considerable progress in agriculture, they practise various simple arts at home, such as dressing the skins of animals, and manufacturing them into rugs and coverlets.

Major Serpa Pinto, who visited Khame's capital in January, 1879, six months before our missionaries reached it, tells us how, some years previously, when the country was threatened with a scarcity of food, the king, like Pharaoh of old, bought up corn wherever it was to be had, and distributed it gratis to his people, expending five thousand pounds in one day alone. Thus, while famine raged around, it was unfelt in the Bamanguato country.

Shoshong, the residence of Khame, occupies a picturesque situation at the mouth of a gorge, with a background of lofty mountains. It is a position of great importance in South African geography, as it is the meeting-point of the three great trade routes from the south, which again diverge from it northwards. It had, some years ago, a population of thirty thousand, which however diminished under the rule of Sekhame, and is now less than half that number. A singular mistake in the position previously assigned to it, has been detected by Major Serpa Pinto; and according to his observations, its place on the map should be shifted westwards sixty miles.

The Jesuit missionaries approached it with beating hearts; for to secure a footing there would have been of great importance to their enterprise. They had, however, little hope of success; for Khame, with all his many virtues, is known to be strongly opposed to the introduction of any other form of Christianity than that of his Wesleyan teachers. We will let them describe their interview with him in their own words:—

In the middle of the court (a great central space, round which the huts were built), a number of the subjects of King Khame were seated on their heels. Khame himself sat on the ground, in the midst of them, like the least of his subjects. He bore no mark of his royal dignity, except an enormous feather fixed in his soft felt hat of English manufacture. His whole dress was that of a townsman of some European country town—leather boots, not polished, brown trousers, a flannel shirt, and a light-coloured coat of English cloth. Khame, who is surnamed the "Gentleman of South Africa," appears to be about thirty-six years old; he is tall, his skin not very black, but almost of an olive tint; his beard and hair thin. He has a noble forehead, mild eyes, and an intelligent look; the lower part of his face is full of expression, and seems full of good-natured kindness, rather than anything else. Beside the king sat the two London missionaries, Messrs. Sykes and Elben. As we did not know the king, it was Mr. Sykes himself who presented us to him. The conversation was carried on through an interpreter. Father Depelchin began by taking out

the letter of recommendation which Sir Bartle Frere had given the missionaries. But he would not read it, or even touch it. Father Depelchin then presented to him a letter from one of his friends at Kimberley; the king took it, but did not open it. He then asked Khame to authorize him and his companions to teach to his people the religion of Christ, as well as the letters, arts and sciences of Europe. The request was coldly received. The king said that he already had teachers. At length Father Depelchin asked him for a place where we could camp. The king replied that he did not know of one. Father Depelchin then ventured to offer the king a present of a splendid Martini-Henry rifle. All the people seemed full of wonder at this beautiful weapon, but Khame looked at it with an air of indifference. He took it in his hand, examined it for a moment, and then gave it back with his thanks; he then added that he would come to the camp to receive it on the following day.

His promised visit was preceded by that of his brother, who is described as his very image.

He seemed deeply moved at the sight of a large picture of Christ on the Cross, which was painted for us by a lady of Grahamstown, and of which we have already spoken. He seemed even more touched at hearing who we were, whence we came, and with what object we were penetrating into Africa. Half-past twelve: the plain in which we are encamped is becoming more and more alive with men, and the crowd is enormous. Here is the King. The "Gentleman of South Africa" approaches us with quiet dignity, followed by all his council. He is a head above all the men of his suite. He enters our tent. We renew, through an interpreter, as before, the requests that we made to him yesterday. He puts a great number of questions on religion to us, and expresses his surprise that there can be two religions in one and the same religion. At last he tells us that he is resolved to take no more teachers for his people besides those he has already, and adds, "That if the two religions, the Catholic and the Protestant, are the same, there clearly is no need of having more than one of them, and if they are different, there would be continual conflicts between them, and they would cause divisions among his subjects."

Khame, despite his refusal, continued courteous and kind, showed great displeasure at hearing that some of the Fathers had been annoyed by the crowd, and to three of their black servants, who had deserted, sent word that they should be immediately expelled from the town. It was with heavy hearts that the missionaries left the territory of this remarkable man to seek a resting-place elsewhere. They directed their course through a barren and inhospitable country, to the lands of the Matabele Zulus, the neighbours and foes of the Bamangwato.

Scarcity of water was the principal anxiety on this part of the route, as it only exists, during the dry season, in scattered pools few and far between. Two of these points are separated by a

forty-eight hours' forced march, known as "the long trek," during which the thirsty cattle have to toil without a drop of water to drink. The route here skirts the plateau of the Great Salt Lakes, one of the most singular features of this portion of the continent. It is an extensive region, over which are thickly scattered shallow depressions, or "salt-pans," varying in size from the largest, which has a diameter of between one and two hundred miles each way, to the tiniest pools and ponds. During the rains they are filled with briny water, and at other times lined with crystallized saline deposits. They are evidently the remains of a great inland sea, which extended hence to the basin of Lake Ngami. The identity in level of the two regions is shown by the fact that the River Zooga, which connects them, has a reversible current, flowing east or west, as the rainfall shifts from one side of the continent to the other. South Africa has a double system of drainage; the flanking ranges which follow the outline of the coast at a long distance from it, sending the streams from their outer slopes, east, south, and west to the sea, but discharging the waters from their inner faces into the great basin of the interior, where they are dispersed and absorbed by the thirsty plains.

The residence of the Zulu king was the next goal of the Mission, and they entered his dominions at Tati, which the working of gold mines in the neighbourhood had some few years ago created a centre of considerable bustle and importance, but which their subsequent abandonment has left to the occupation of a few Boer hunters and Kafir families. Here the Mission divided for a time, as it was considered advisable for the Superior, accompanied by Father Law and Brother de Sadeleer, to proceed with one waggon to the capital, and obtain the King's authorization to settle in his dominions, leaving the rest of the expedition to await the result.

This party, during the absence of their companions, were attacked with severe illness. Father Croonenberghs, the first to suffer, was seized with violent rheumatic fever, and was ill for several weeks. The greatest kindness and sympathy was shown him by the Boers, who assisted in removing him from his waggon, and preparing a bed for him, came daily to sit with him, and brought the choicest morsels of their game to tempt his appetite. Indeed, all the Fathers partook of the hunters' diet, for they write: "Giraffe and antelope, buffalo and wild ostrich are now our ordinary food."

It was at Tati, on the 22nd of August, that one of the party, Brother de Vylder, a former Pontifical Zouave, who had come out as a novice, pronounced his vows. But their stay there was destined to be marked by a more melancholy event, the first

break in the ranks of their little band. Father Charles Fuchs, whose health, always delicate, was worn out by the toils and hardships he had encountered, succumbed to an attack of fever supervening on general debility, on January 28, 1880. So the Fathers may be said to have taken possession of their Mission, thus consecrated by the first sacrifice of the life of one of their number.

The three others, meantime, had reached the capital, Gubulawayo, after eight days' journey through a picturesque country, well watered and wooded. A characteristic feature of the landscape are the Koppies, isolated masses of granite, whose fantastic forms produce a striking effect. They first came in contact with the natives at a village two days' journey from Tati, where they were detained in order to wait for the king's permission to advance further. Father Law's journal thus describes the scene :—

August 28.—The natives swarming round us all the day, crying out, *tusa*, "make a present," or *tengēla*, "buy." They brought milk in abundance, pumpkins, &c. We bought a native axe, amongst other things. One of them, a fine strapping fellow, was most eloquent in begging me to buy a milk-pail. He exhausted every motive to get me to buy it. "Here are mere boys, whose things are bought, and I, a man, and my things are not bought." Asked me my *isibongo* (name of praise), to use it to coax me; said, "Ah, you hate me." At last I told him I was beaten by him, and gave him a handkerchief. He looked at it round and round, and then jumped for joy; and then, with a short *sala kahle* (good-by), put it round his head, and ran as hard as he could for the village, singing and shouting as he went. If what we saw to-day is a specimen of the Matabele, either they have changed much for the better lately, or have been much calumniated. Certainly, they weary you much with their *tusa* and *tengēla*, but there is nothing rude or rough about them, and for my part I was charmed with the poor simple creatures.

On the arrival of a letter from Mr. Fairbairn, an English resident of Gubulawayo, conveying the king's permission for the advance of the Fathers, they started for his residence, passing on the way through a picturesque and fertile country, and surrounded everywhere by groups of friendly but importunate savages. Lo Bengula lost no time in receiving the new comers, and they were introduced with all due solemnity to this powerful monarch, the absolute ruler of a country measuring about three hundred miles in each direction.

How little of royal State was discoverable in his surroundings may be gathered from Father Law's description :—

We crawled through the entrance into the hut with Fairbairn, and there was Lo Bengula lying on the ground, with about eight

or nine of his wives sitting opposite. Fairbairn explained our mission briefly, and read the Governor's letter of introduction. Lo Bengula said there were many teachers already, and they had done nothing, but did not give a final answer, and then went on to chat with Fairbairn, who seems to be on very intimate terms with him. Plenty of *utywala* (Kafir beer) was handed round, and afterwards meat was brought in.

The audience concluded with a performance of two native magicians, who, somewhat in the style of spiritualist mediums, pretended to answer all questions by the help of a mysterious little calabash. Being asked whether Lo Bengula were not a great king, the oracle was naturally courtly enough to answer in the affirmative; but its further revelations were cut short by Mr. Fairbairn's ridicule of the whole exhibition, and the king then suggesting that the creature should be asked if it would not like to withdraw, the hint was immediately acted on by its proprietors. The king returned the visit of the Fathers next day, and was friendly and even familiar in his manners, catching hold of the Superior's beard, and comparing it to the mane of a lion; but he still gave no decisive answer as to the establishment of the Mission, declaring again that there were teachers enough, and that his boys wanted to work, not learn.

Meanwhile, the Matabele Court was a scene of bustle and excitement, in preparation for no less an event than a royal wedding. Lo Bengula was about to plight his troth, or at least a small fraction of it, to nine additional wives at once, of whom the principal was Calinja, daughter of the neighbouring potentate, Umzila. This princess had come with a train of a thousand attendants, under the command of an Induna, or chief, and the interest with which they listened to Father Law's explanation of the object of the Mission, inspired him with the desire which he afterwards carried out, of devoting himself to the evangelization of their country. The royal kraal during the next few days was a scene of savage festivity, to which the natives flocked in from all the country. Kafir beer flowed in profusion, oxen were slaughtered and devoured, and barbaric songs and dances enlivened the camp with their wild animation. The 26th of September was fixed for the marriage ceremony, which was performed by two native sorcerers, in presence of an idol, in a cave in the mountain side, the king and his brides remaining outside this sanctuary.

Lo Bengula's marriage with Calinja was an important event for Matabele State relations, as it not only indicated an alliance with the previously inimical Abagasi, but was intended to give a direct heir to the Crown, for the succession to which the king's other children were not considered

eligible. It also excluded his sister Nina from the influence and partial share in his government she had, as heiress presumptive, hitherto enjoyed, and prepared her subsequent decline in the royal favour. The Fathers continued their daily visits to the savage monarch, and gradually made way in his confidence, principally, it must be confessed, by their skill in various mechanical arts. A great step was gained when the royal waggon, which had fallen into disrepair, was entrusted to them for renovation; and the king's admiration and gratitude knew no bounds when it was returned to him, not alone strengthened, but beautified with heraldic devices; an assegai and battle-axe, surmounted by a crown, appearing as the royal arms of the Matabele kingdom. Father Law treated a boy successfully for snake-bite, and another of those reptiles was shot by the well-directed aim of one of the missionaries, all which proofs of their various accomplishments tended to raise them in the king's estimation. But the crowning triumph was achieved by the performance of the sewing machine, which, worked by one of the Brothers, in presence of the whole Court, excited universal wonder and delight.

"What people these English are!" exclaimed the king in admiration, "They can do anything, and yet they must die like ourselves!"

At last, on the 18th of October, Lo Bengula granted the long-delayed sanction to the missionaries establishing themselves in his country, at least for a time, and shortly after ratified this decision by authorizing them to purchase the house and premises of Mr. Greit, a trader, who was about leaving. Father Depelchin started immediately for Tati to bring up others of the party, and before Christmas they had organized their little community in their new abode. They were, however, for some time so unsettled, that a stable had to be used as a chapel, and here the Mass of the Nativity was celebrated amidst surroundings that recalled those of the great event it commemorated. Thus, the opening of 1880 found the first stage of their undertaking completed, and a footing gained in the promised land of their spiritual inheritance. Their success in further advances must depend on the security of their position here; and to conduce to this end they are now devoting themselves energetically to the study of the language, customs and manners of the people among whom they are placed.

The history of the Matabele empire, now, since the defeat of the southern Zulus by the British, the most powerful native State south of the Zambesi, is characteristic of this part of Africa. Among the Lieutenants of Chaka, the celebrated Zulu chief, was a young soldier, named Moselikatze, whose ambition led him to throw off his allegiance to his leader. He drove off

his booty to the heart of the Transvaal, subduing various native tribes, and inflicting defeats on the troops sent against him by Chaka, and his successor, Dingan. He was finally, in 1836, dislodged and routed by the Boers, before whom he fled to the north, with the remnant of his force, now reduced to forty "ring-heads," or full-grown warriors. His ambition and enterprise, however, survived his defeat, and the peaceful agricultural population to the south of the Zambesi began to suffer from his ravages, after the tsetse fly had driven him back from his projected settlement north of that river. In the middle of the night he swooped on their sleeping villages, set fire to the huts, slaughtered the men, and drove off to his camp, cattle, women, and boys. These latter were trained as soldiers and incorporated in his army; the cattle served as food, and the women as slaves. A determined foe to the tender passion, the moment he saw one of his warriors disposed to treat a woman with more consideration than a mere beast of burden, he nipped in the bud what he considered this effeminate weakness by the immediate slaughter of its unoffending cause.

Thus, gradually extending his power, from a mere freebooter he became the Sovereign of a powerful State with subject populations, and founded a second Zulu Empire in South Africa. The State he consolidated is organized as a military despotism, in which the whole soil of the country, and every living thing that it contains, are absolutely at the disposal of its ruler. The warriors, 20,000 in number, live in barracks under strict discipline, each division of the army being commanded by an "induna," or chief, having sub-chiefs acting as his subordinates. There are few real Zulu soldiers in the ranks, the veterans being principally Bechuanas, stolen as boys by Moselikatze, while the younger warriors are the youth of the present subject races, Makalakas and Mashonas, enlisted in the same compulsory fashion. These captive lads are continually exercised in the use of weapons from their boyhood, and become so vigorous and muscular from this course of training as to be no longer recognizable as members of their former tribes. It is this system of military organization that makes the Zulus so formidable to the other natives of South Africa, that the rumour of a Matabele raid is sufficient to create a panic at any time, either in Khame's Town, Shoshong, or in Lialui, the capital of the Zambesi. The subject population of Matabele Land may be divided into two principal races—the Makalakas to the west, and the Mashonas to the east. Of the latter, only a portion have been completely reduced, and the rest of the tribe supply the Zulu warriors with opportunities for constant raids, and their ranks with fresh recruits. The Makalakas, since their subjugation, have retrograded in every way, have lost what skill in agriculture

they possessed, and present a miserable and degraded appearance. In one art alone they remain unrivalled, for as dexterous thieves they surpass all the other races of South Africa, and have consequently a very bad reputation among travellers. The system of forcible conscription is imposed upon all these subject tribes, and their youth are enrolled among the celibate warriors of the Zulu king.

The Matabele have all the arrogance of a dominant race; and Mr. Oates, whose premature death in their country was one of the many losses inflicted on science by the African climate, says of them, in the posthumously published work at the head of this article:—"The amount of pride you must pocket in sojourning amongst these scantily dressed gentlemen is a thing not to be forgotten. I don't know whether their condescensions or aggressions are the most difficult to bear with patience." If they are thus overbearing in their demeanour to white men, it may be imagined how oppressive is their rule over the inferior races subject to them. The Makalakas they speak of and treat as dogs, and the Bushmen, or Masarwas—nomads scattered through a portion of their territory—they hunt down as game. The Mashonas, who, though a more warlike race than these, are equally at their mercy, because their villages have never combined for mutual defence, are harried and decimated by their perpetual raids. Of these tribes, the Makalakas are considered by the missionaries, despite their present degraded condition, the most fitted for civilisation and Christianity; and in the neighbourhood of Shoshong, where their fields of maize and millet are admirably cultivated, they give proofs of a certain capacity for progress and improvement. These vassal races enjoy perfect liberty of conscience in the practice of all their native superstitions; but, despite the toleration, and even encouragement extended to foreign missionaries, the adoption of Christianity is forbidden under pain of death.

The present ruler of Matabele Land, the son and successor of Moselikatze, has not inherited the systematic ferocity of his father, and may be considered rather above the average level of African monarchs. He evidently has a strong, though untutored, intelligence, and is quite capable of understanding the material advantages likely to accrue to him from the settlement of white men in his dominions. Their presents are most acceptable to him, and their trade he recognizes as lucrative and beneficial. Englishmen he regards with peculiar favour; but Boers are objects of corresponding antipathy, from their indiscriminate slaughter of animals for the sake of their skins alone. The sympathies of British game-preservers will be with him in his indignation at the destruction of elephant cows and calves, whose

ivory is comparatively worthless, as well as in his disapproval of the consumption of ostrich eggs as a culinary dainty. "If you eat the eggs, how are you to have feathers?" he not unreasonably asks, if he sees tell-tale fragments of the shells about an encampment.

But Lo Bengula, notwithstanding his general friendliness to white men, has rather a doubtful reputation in South Africa, and the recent disaster to Captain Paterson and his party is, rightly or wrongly, generally put down to his account. This officer, whose death was the great topic of conversation during Major Serpa Pinto's visit to Shoshong in January, 1879, was entrusted with an official mission from the English Government to various African chiefs, and among others to Lo Bengula. Having completed his negotiations with the latter potentate, he desired to make a trip from his dominions to the Falls of the Zambesi, and invited young Mr. Thomas, son of a missionary resident in the country, to accompany him. The King, however, disapproved strongly of this arrangement, after having previously sanctioned it; and on the eve of the start warned the young man, whom he considered, he said, a son of the tribe, having been brought up amongst them, not to join the English party, as he had a presentiment that some evil would befall them. Mr. Thomas declared he did not believe in presentiments (it would have been wise, it seems, to make an exception in favour of royal ones), set out for the Zambesi with the party, and, like them, never returned. Various rumours were current as to their fate, some averring they had been poisoned, others shot down; but nothing definite was known, nor could any say who brought the news of their death. The general belief is that they were assassinated by orders of Lo Bengula, and, of course, his "presentiment" of their fate is extremely suspicious. But it must be considered, on the other hand, that such a crime would be entirely motiveless, and is, moreover, directly contrary to the ordinary tenour of his policy, as he shows a nervous regard for the health and safety of white men in his dominions, and seems exceedingly apprehensive of any accident befalling them. The tragedy, therefore, of the total disappearance of this party remains shrouded in mystery. Lo Bengula is a man of gigantic stature, and of exceptionally dark colour, even among his swarthy race. He affects none of the refinements of European dress, and his *pièce de résistance* in the way of costume is a waist-cloth. His relations with the missionaries will be best illustrated by some of the incidents of their life at his capital.

Gubulawayo, where he finally permitted them to establish themselves, has advantages of situation not often found among African towns, for it stands on an elevated plateau, over four

thousand feet above the sea, among the Matoppos Mountains, which part the affluents of the Zambesi and Crocodile Rivers. It commands an extensive view over the champaign country beneath, and its inhabitants enjoy that sense of exhilaration and freedom conveyed by a spacious width of uplifted horizon. Its mean temperature is that of Madeira; its summer heats are tempered by the mountain breezes, and the sharp frosts of its short winter by the warmth of its tropical sun. It is free from fever, and otherwise healthy for Europeans, as its steep slopes do not retain the floods of the rainy season, whose miasmatic evaporation poisons the swampy lowlands. A few white merchants reside there, and the scale of their operations may be judged by the fact that Mr. Greit, who sold his establishment to the Fathers, started for the Colonies with a train of waggons, carrying ten thousand pounds of ivory, and four hundred of ostrich feathers. Three months previously, another load of six thousand pounds of ivory had been despatched from Gubulawayo, and the missionary caravan had met between the Transvaal and Shoshong, waggons carrying in the aggregate twenty thousand pounds of tusks. With the little English community, including the Protestant missionaries, the Jesuit Fathers were soon on the best of terms, and met with nothing but help and encouragement from them. Their new residence, which was dedicated to the Sacred Heart, was purchased for five hundred pounds. It consisted of several buildings and outhouses, and amongst them an iron house used for warehousing goods, which now served admirably as a chapel. A hectare of ground was contained within their enclosure, and it soon presented an animated scene when peopled with live stock. Thirty-eight sheep, and twelve calves, two beautiful milch-cows and their calves, with the draught oxen of the waggons, made a goodly show of ruminant quadrupeds; and suitable accommodation was also found for thirty hens, purchased with coarse cotton stuff, at the rate of ten centimes each. A cloth of the value of four francs was the price of a sheep, an animal of a species peculiar to the country, larger than the European breeds, and having, instead of a fleece, smooth wool or hair, resembling rather that of a goat. Its most striking feature, however, is its tail, which is an accumulation of fat, sometimes weighing as much as twenty pounds, and serving for culinary purposes, instead of butter, lard, or oil. It is for these appendages that the Boers are popularly supposed to provide the animals with little carts on which to draw them after them, a fact in natural history for which, however, we decline to vouch. Wheat was excessively dear, but maize cheap, and it formed the principal article of the Fathers' diet. They dressed it in various ways: boiling the ears for six or seven hours, when they were eaten

like a vegetable; or throwing the detached grains into boiling grease or butter, when they swell, crack, and are said to form an excellent dessert if eaten lightly powdered with sugar. Native women came every morning with fresh maize for sale, carrying loads of it in wicker baskets on their heads, and followed by boys with water-melons, gourds, and other succulent vegetables.

The natives, who have abundance of cattle, as their country is free from tsetse, use a good deal of meat, and cook it admirably. Cut into junks, and thrown into a great stew-pan, on the lid of which burning embers are placed, it forms a savoury dish that an epicure need not disdain. The use of milk, butter, and cheese, is strictly prohibited to adults, as the milk of the cows is exclusively reserved for the children, who up to twelve years old taste nothing else. As soon as they can walk, they go together twice a day to the kraal of the cows, and there, under the superintendence of Makweke, the induna, or captain of Gubulawayo, make their repasts after the fashion of Romulus and Remus, as portrayed on ancient monuments.

The men are given up to idleness, save when out on some marauding expedition, and spend their days in drinking and smoking, squatted round the *kotlas*, or enclosures of the *indunas*, and *enkose* (the king). The women do all the work of agriculture, building, beer and tobacco making, &c., and are treated as the veriest slaves. Though, like all races of Zulus, the Matabele seem inaccessible to the higher ideas of religion, they are by no means free from superstition, and have the same beliefs in witchcraft and sorcery current throughout Africa. They have, however, a vague idea of a supreme being, called in their language, "the king above," *Enkose pesoul*, but they pay him no worship, and associate him with no rites. They hold in veneration the spirits of their dead kings, and the burial-place of Moselikatze is accounted sacred, and is the scene of celebrations and solemn feasts. Their religious observances principally consist of dances; and the beginning of each year is marked by the festival of the Great Dance, held in honour of the first fruits, which it is not lawful for any one to touch until they have been thus consecrated. The dances of the warriors are very imposing, as they defile before the king, crowned with nodding plumes of black ostrich feathers, clad in skins, and brandishing their assegais, while they sing in chorus the grand national hymn. The refrain of this war-song, "Have you heard the news? The news of the assegai?" chanted in perfect unison by thousands of savage voices, is described as producing a thrilling and even terrific effect.

But the most singular of the Matabele superstitions is one identical with that of the ancient Greeks, attributing oracular utterances of a divinity to a particular spot. The Zulu Delphi

is situated eleven miles from Gubulawayo, where the god Makalaka has his residence, in a cavern approached by a winding entrance. From a perpendicular shaft in the midst of this grotto issue terrible subterranean thunders. The votaries lay their offerings on the edge of the chasm, and declaring the object of their visit, their desire for information as to some future event, or wish to penetrate some hidden secret, await the response in silence. Then, amid the thunders of the abyss, are heard inarticulate sounds, confused murmurs, which are interpreted by the sorcerers to their credulous disciples. This cavern deity has sons and daughters, who are his priests and priestesses, and live near his grotto. Notwithstanding their sacred character and parentage, three of these hierophants were recently put to death for stealing the king's corn.

To this oracle the Princess Nina appealed to establish her innocence, when accused of having conspired with some fetish men to cast a spell on the king's house, that he might not have a male heir. After Lo Bengula's marriage with Umzila's daughter, Calinja, his sister, deposed from her previous position of importance, had withdrawn from Court, and retired into the mountains. Hence she was summoned to answer before a family council of Lo Bengula's brothers, held at his residence, the "White Rocks," to the charge brought against her. She denied the accusation, and offered to submit to the judgment of the oracle of the god Makalaka, to clear her of the suspicion. The missionaries' letters do not recount the result of this supernatural arbitration, so we may conclude that the affair was allowed to drop.

Lo Bengula's subjects, while utterly indifferent to the spiritual teaching of the Fathers, showed themselves as anxious as other savages to avail themselves of their skill in physicking the body. The king himself called in their aid in a severe attack of rheumatism, and they earned the demonstrative gratitude of the induna of a village three days' march from Gubulawayo, by curing him of inveterate ophthalmia. When they refused all payment for this service, declaring it to have been done for love of the *Enkose-pesoul* (the King above), his admiration knew no bounds, and he promised them abundance of flocks and herds, "long-horned oxen, and fat-tailed sheep," if they would settle in his country. A few days later, he brought his daughter, who had been ill for two years, imploring them to cure her; and for her, too, they prescribed with success. One of their earliest charges was a poor leper, who had no shelter, save some cavity in the rocks. A hut was built for him near their enclosure, with the help of Mr. Martin, a charitable merchant, where the Fathers visit him daily, to his unbounded consolation. Each day he

drags himself to the door of the Mission, and lays down his iron porringer to be filled with meat and vegetables from the Fathers' table. This outcast of society is likely to be their first convert in Matabele Land.

Whenever Lo Bengula moved from one of his residences to the other he expected the white residents to follow in his train to do him honour. As soon as the royal party was seen on its way to the kraal, it was the signal for a general start, and a sort of improvised picnic party accompanied his majesty to his country house. The Fathers describe themselves as much amused at having "to run about the Veldt after the king," but understood it was his wish that they should do so.

The difficulties constantly arising in the management of untutored savages are illustrated by the conduct of the missionaries' native servant, *October*. On being refused a claim for double the wages agreed on, he determined to be revenged, and that same evening, while the Fathers were engaged in searching the heavens for the comet, then (February, 1880) expected to be visible, their thoughts were recalled to earth by the appearance of one of their cowherds, with dismay expressed in every lineament of his sable countenance. "*October*," he said, "is gone, carrying off one of our fine cows and her brown calf. He went off when the sun was over the Mountain of Serpents, and was last seen driving the beasts southwards."

Next morning, at break of day, one of the Fathers and Mr. Martin were in the saddle, and off to the "White Rocks," eleven miles from Gubulawayo, to seek redress from Lo Bengula.

After an hour-and-half's gallop over mountain and valley, we arrive and fasten our animals to the stockade of the rustic palace of the "King of kings." We pass amid groups of Kafirs squatted round the royal hut, without saluting anyone; for such is the etiquette of these mountains. We then kneel at the orifice of the hut, and call to the king, "Koumalo! Koumalo!"—Lord! Lord!—and the King replies, "Sakou, bona!"—Good morning, come in! We then creep into the interior of the hut, which is as dark as a black oven, and sit on the ground without further ceremony.

After the sudden change from light to darkness, we can see nothing for the first five minutes. Gradually we distinguish surrounding objects.

Lo Bengula was stretched on the ground at his ease, lying on a Scotch plaid, to the right of the entrance; his left elbow rested on a bolster, and his right hand clutched an enormous piece of roast meat, which he was devouring with visible appetite. To the left of the entrance I perceived Queen Qwalila, engaged in eating a slice of beef which she had received from her royal spouse.

We had taken our places in the centre of the hut, near the pole which supports it. I was seated in front of the Queen, Mr. Martin

facing the King. Lo Bengula made a sign to a slave standing apart, who went out, and soon returned, bringing us a dish intended as a welcome. It was a plate of European manufacture, piled with cutlets powdered with salt. We hastened to thank the King with the formula prescribed by etiquette: "Koumalo!" The King replied with a simple inclination of the head, *annuit*, and we attacked the dish. For myself, I first made the sign of the cross; the King looked at me in much astonishment. I told him it was a religious usage, analogous to their purificatory ceremonies. He seemed satisfied with this answer.

After the repast, the King presented us his packet of Transvaal tobacco, and box of Swedish matches. When the perfume of the pipe succeeded the steam of the roast beef, Mr. Martin began, and in the Bechuana language explained to the King the object of our visit.

Lo Bengula promised redress, and the conversation then took a political direction, turning on the difficulties between the English and Russians. The king then went on to complain of the bad faith of the Boers in commercial transactions, after which his visitors were dismissed, with a cordial shake-hands, from the presence of his Zulu majesty.

The thievish propensities of the natives furnished the Fathers with never-failing occasions for the exercise of the virtue of patience. One of them thus narrates an experience of this kind:—

About a fortnight ago Mr. Martin, an excellent Englishman, a native of Jersey, came to invite me to go on a fishing excursion. I could not refuse his request, so we take our lines, and our spade for digging worms, mount our frisky ponies, sure-paced and noisy-hoofed, and are off at a hand gallop, over rock and ravine, through marsh and wood. No landscape in our country can give you any idea of the environs of Gubulawayo; Epirus and Thessaly alone may perhaps bear some resemblance to those masses of rocks, superimposed one on the other, in grotesque fashion, as though by the agency of Titans—

Ter sunt conati imponere Pelio Ossam
Scilicet, atque Ossae frondosum involvere Olympum.

After two hours of a regular steeple-chase, we debouch at the top of a rock, on the valley of the Umzingwane, and begin a somewhat perilous descent. However, our quadrupeds acquit themselves admirably of their task, and we arrive safe and sound at the plain, on the banks of a pretty stream. We cast our lines, and the first take is an immense crab, which I haul out, to my great surprise. Soon a serpent is seen crawling straight towards us on the surface of the water. Like the dragon of Hippolytus, "his croup," &c. But reassure yourself; I present him the end of my line, he takes the hook, I draw him out, and a blow of a riding whip from Mr. Martin stretches him stiff and dead on the slope. Next appears a tiger-striped eel, the sight of which terrifies and puts to flight the blacks of the neighbourhood who had come down to watch our fishing, as they

take it for a viper, *Inioke*. Soon after they draw near the spot where we have left our ponies, instruments, paletots and hats. Mr. Martin hears the neighing of our steeds, and happily reaches in time to rescue them and our property. One of the darkies then begins to speak to us with an insinuating air. Mr. Martin distrusts him, and says to me "Look to our hats." After two hours' fishing we pack up; I seize my horse's mane to climb into the saddle, and lose sight of the nigger for a moment. In this brief instant my head-gear is snatched off, and I see it fly off to a distance, into the thick of the rushes edging the stream. I give a shout, Mr. Martin leaps on his horse and pursues the thief. I try to do the same, but my pony, urged along by the speed of the other, will not allow me to mount. Five minutes after, Mr. Martin shouts from the top of a rock, "Come on—it is too late!" My felt was lost. But what vexed us most was the pretended indignation of the other blacks, who, while uttering imprecations on the thief, would certainly have robbed us also, if our terrible whips of rhinoceros hide, and the heels of our quadrupeds, had not inspired them with respect. This, then, was what a day's fishing in South Africa cost me; a hat.

Picturesque scenery seems to surround the Matabele capital in all directions, and one of the Fathers, despatched to the Mountain of Serpents, *Entab-Enioka*, about nine miles off, to superintend the cutting of wood for building, was much struck with the beauty of this part of the country. Torrents and cascades were seen in all directions, in the midst of luxuriant vegetation; while birds of the most varied song and plumage lent animation to the forest. One of the most curious of these is the bell-ringer crow, a species of bird like a rook, uttering at regular intervals a piercing note, compared to the tinkle of the bell of some sylvan hermitage. To all beauties of Nature the natives seem as insensible as the beasts of the field.

During the winter months, from April to September, no rain ever falls, but during the wet season, lasting from November to March inclusive, a series of brief but violent storms follow each other in rapid succession, sometimes at the rate of six or seven in the day. Black clouds gather from all quarters of the heavens, and deliver perfect salvos of electrical discharges, accompanied by deluges of rain, which fill the ravines in a few moments with rushing torrents. Communication at this season is difficult, and the post at Gubulawayo, generally delivered once a fortnight by native couriers, becomes exceedingly irregular in its arrival.

It was, of course, necessary to defer all further missionary explorations until after the cessation of the rains; but Father Law, from the time he had conversed with the attendants who came from Umzila's dominions in the suite of Lo Bengula's queen, had been seized with a desire to preach the Gospel in their

country, and only waited until travelling was practicable, to put his design into operation. On the 28th of May, 1880, he therefore started from Gubulawayo with Father Wehl and two Brothers, on the journey that was to cost him his life. Taking with them two Matabele attendants assigned to them by Lo Bengula, they made their way slowly but unimpeded through the country of the Mashonas, subject to that monarch. Their difficulties began when they crossed the Sabi river, and found themselves among the portion of the tribe which owe nominal allegiance to Umzila, but seem in reality independent of control. The indunas became more and more menacing in their language as they advanced into the country, while their progress was delayed by the absence of a practicable road for the waggon. At last, August 5, they came to a place where they had to cut a passage through the rock, and while in the midst of this arduous work, surrounded by a crowd of insolent savages, they perceived to their utter consternation that Father Wehl had disappeared. This misfortune still further complicated the embarrassment of their position. For three days the Matabele escort scoured the country in vain, without finding any trace of the missing Father; and all this time the demeanour of the crowd round the waggon became more hostile and threatening. At last a desperate resolution was taken, and the little band, to avoid a worse disaster, resolved to abandon the waggon and make their escape by night. Taking then their arms, some supplies of food, and the altar furniture, the three Europeans and their four faithful attendants—two Matabeles and two other natives—stole off under cover of the darkness, to make their way on foot, by forced marches, to Umzila's kraal. This was on the night of the 10th of August, and before noon on the following day they had placed twenty miles between them and their enemies, and were out of reach of pursuit. They suffered great hardships from fatigue and exposure on their march, but were fortunate in finding game in abundance; one of the Matabeles shot a large rhinoceros, and antelopes and other smaller animals were also killed. At last, on the 20th of August, ten days after leaving the waggon, the party reached Umzila's residence exhausted from the harassing march, and all suffering more or less from the lowering fever of the country, Brother de Sadeleer alone being in a state to attend on the others. They were received immediately in a friendly audience by Umzila, who sent them supplies of provisions; but as his herds have been ravaged by the tsetse, not on so magnificent a scale as the presents of his royal son-in-law, Lo Bengula. He sent a party in charge of Brother de Sadeleer to recover the waggon, which was found in safety, as the Mashonas, finding the white men had escaped from

them, and knowing they had taken refuge with Umzila, dreaded the vengeance of that chief if they pillaged it.

Meantime, what had become of Father Wehl, lost and alone in the midst of a savage country? He had wandered from the track, and lost sight of the waggon, owing to an unexpected change in its line of advance; then, after eighteen hours' hopeless search for it, had abandoned the attempt to regain it, and determined to return to Gubulawayo. Twice he was without food for forty-eight hours, and at other times his daily ration consisted of a handful of flour, bought at some village by the way. The first ten nights he slept in trees, for six more he lay down under the shelter of their branches, but the ten last nights of his solitary wanderings he spent stretched on the bare ground, too exhausted from cold and weariness to seek a lodging less exposed to the attacks of wild beasts. At the end of twenty-six days of this life he was picked up by four natives, who, after holding many councils as to the fate of their prisoner, finally decided to put him to death. The 18th of September was fixed for his execution, and on the previous evening he was provided with an unusually good supper, and told it was his last. On the very day appointed for his death he was rescued by the opportune arrival of Mr. Robert Roxby, an inhabitant of the Transvaal, who, having heard of his captivity, came with four servants to release him. After various plans of operation had been projected and found impracticable, he set out again on foot, and on the fifth day of his march, October 28, reached once more the abandoned waggon, and met the party sent out for its recovery. The setting in of the rainy season interposed fresh obstacles to their advance, and one of the Brothers was taken ill, and had to be carried over the mountains by relays of native bearers, requisitioned from village to village. Thus, it was only on the 13th of January that Father Wehl reached Umzila's kraal, to find that Father Law had died there the 25th of November previous, worn out by the successive attacks of the fever caught on his journey.

It was his last recommendation that the mission to Umzila's country should be abandoned as impracticable, but Father Wehl does not agree in this view. Much of the country he saw seemed to him healthy and fertile, and he thinks that a station might be chosen at a higher level than Umzila's village, but within easy reach of it, while in communication with Sofala, on the sea-coast, as well. The recent deaths of Mr. Phipson Wybrants, and several of his expedition, however, while attempting to penetrate into the interior from the direction of the latter place, seems a bad omen for the practicability of the country as a residence for white men.

The Mission, reinforced by fresh recruits from Europe, is thus in occupation of three stations. Gubulawayo, Tati, near the frontier of Matabele Land, and Umzila's town. Meanwhile, its original objective point, the Zambesi, has not been lost sight of, and advices from the Cape, of February, 1881, announce the return of Father Depelchin from a journey of exploration in that direction.*

Two recent explorers, Dr. Holub, and Major Serpa Pinto, have given us very detailed information as to this region, where they both made a prolonged sojourn, confirming the accounts of all previous travellers as to its pestilential climate. This, indeed, is a necessary consequence of its physical peculiarities, for the whole Zambesi valley, having an average width of thirty miles, is nothing more than the overflow-bed of the river during its annual inundation, and remains at other times intersected with lagoons and stagnant ponds—the very hotbeds of poisonous germs. These reservoirs supply the ordinary drinking water of the inhabitants, who, driven to the heights by the rising of the waters, return to the low-lying villages on their subsidence. It is not to be wondered at, then, that a prolonged stay in the district is certain inoculation with miasmatic fever, not only for Europeans, but even for natives acclimatized to other parts of Africa.

Nevertheless, the population of the country is concentrated in the lowlands, and the heights to the south of the river seem to be nearly devoid of inhabitants. The entire Zambesi valley as far as Portuguese territory on the east, forms a single powerful kingdom, that of the Marutse-Mabunda, Barotse, or Lui, who rule as a dominant race, over various enslaved or vassal tribes.

The history of the country, up to a certain point, repeats that of Matabele Land, for here, too, a conqueror from the south, Sebituane, at the head of a Basuto army, subdued the native population, and established a foreign empire. But the resemblance stops at this point, for the Makololos, as the invaders were called, decimated by the climate, and enervated by self-indulgence, were eventually exterminated by the original inhabitants, who restored their native dynasty after three generations of Basuto rule. The language of the conquerors still remains, and a dialect of Sesuto is the prevailing one in the Barotse kingdom. The country is at present in an unsettled condition as to government, for two revolutions had swept over it in the interval between Dr. Holub's visit, in 1875, and Major Serpa Pinto's, in August, 1878; and one of the deposed monarchs, since restored, was then

* A letter from Father Depelchin, of June 4, 1881, announces the establishment of a station at Pandama-tenga, 50 miles from the Falls of the Zambesi. The Fathers have suffered much from fever, but the Superior hopes to build a sanatorium on some neighbouring high ground, and to counteract the malaria in the valley by the plantation of eucalyptus.

hovering as a pretender on the frontier. These rulers appear to be of a very low type, both as to intelligence and morality, and Major Serpa Pinto narrowly escaped several treacherous attempts, made apparently with the consent or connivance of the then reigning monarch or his counsellors. The general moral standard of the inhabitants seems low in proportion to their relative cultivation in other respects. They are cleanly in their persons, using frequent baths and ablutions; their cookery is sufficiently refined to please a European palate, and they are not without some fundamental notions of medicine. Their riches consist in large herds of cattle, as they scarcely till the ground; their food, of sweet potatoes and milk in various forms. The wild fruits of the country would alone almost suffice to support life, as a variety of trees produce in succession abundance of succulent and nutritious food. The capital of the Barotse has been transferred to a point considerably higher up the river than that occupied by the old town, Sesheke, and apparently still more unhealthy. It is to be hoped that no attempt will be made by the missionaries to occupy any part of the Zambesi valley itself, a step which could only result in the sacrifice of valuable lives, as it may be safely asserted that no European could survive a year's residence within its limits. Their idea, indeed, seems rather to be to seek, in the unexplored country to the north of the river, an eligible site for a station; but, even then, the obstacles to travelling and communicating through the Barotse country would be very great. For the present, save by adopting Portuguese territory as a base of operations—any further northern extension of the Mission seems almost impossible.

The Zambesi region is dear to the imaginations of all connected with the Jesuit order, as the scene of the martyrdom of one of its early members. Father Gonzalez Silveira, a Portuguese Jesuit, born in Almeira, in 1526, when engaged in missionary work on the East Coast of Africa, was seized with the desire to explore and evangelize the great native kingdom of Monomotapa, lying some hundreds of miles inland from the territory of Portugal. After an arduous voyage of many months, made entirely on foot, carrying the altar furniture on his shoulders, wading many of the rivers, and transported across others in native rafts or canoes, he reached the capital of Monomotapa on St. Stephen's Day, 1560. A Portuguese, Antonio Caiado, was settled there in command of the army, said to have numbered 100,000 men, of whom 30,000 were stationed in the neighbourhood of the capital. The king received the Jesuit favourably, and was much struck by his disinterestedness in refusing his presents, amongst which gold is specified. A statue of the Madonna seen in his house was taken for a real woman by the natives, who repeated to the king that the stranger had brought his wife with him. The king on seeing

the statute, requested it should be left to him, to which the Father gladly consented. For five nights in succession the monarch had a dream, in which a similar figure appeared to him, and addressed him in an unknown language; and so great was the impression made on him that he desired to become a Christian, and was baptized with his mother and three hundred of his principal subjects, about thirty days after Father Silveira's arrival.

But the missionary's rapid success alarmed the jealousy of the Mahometan residents, and they plotted his destruction, accusing him to the king of being a Portuguese spy, come to subvert his kingdom. Their machinations were successful; the king ordered his execution, and eight assassins, stealing into his hut at night, threw themselves on him, and after having strangled him with a cord, threw his body into the river. His death, which took place on Passion Sunday, March 18, 1561, was followed by a partial massacre of his converts, but led to reprisals on the part of the Portuguese, their invasion of the kingdom, and the expulsion of the Mahometan settlers. Thenceforward, the kingdom of Monomotapa is heard of no more in history, and the site it occupied can only be conjectured from very contradictory indications in the narrative.

But sixty years later, another Jesuit Father, Alphonse Leo, in travelling through the same country, came upon an island of the Zambesi, where, according to native tradition, the body of a white man washed ashore more than half a century previous, was still miraculously guarded by the wild beasts and birds. This later narrative speaks of the river which flowed through Monomotapa, elsewhere called the Mosengesi, or Motetes, as a tributary of the Zambesi; and this fact affords some clue to the position of this country, which has much puzzled modern geographers. An existing river, the Zingesi, which we may fairly identify with the Mosengesi of the narrative, flows into the Zambesi from the south, not far from the Portuguese district of Tete, and its alternative designation of Motetes is possibly connected with this latter name. Close to this river is another called the Mpata, and Mabate is mentioned as the principal halting-place of Father Silveira on his journey to Monomotapa. Gold, again, is specified among the king's presents to the Jesuit, and a gold field is marked on the map, about a hundred miles distant from the above-mentioned points. The disruption of the kingdom was doubtless consequent on the Portuguese invasion following the missionary's death, when a portion of it was probably incorporated with the territory of the invaders, and the remainder became disintegrated in process of time. We think, then, we are justified in concluding that Monomotapa occupied the country south of the Zambesi, and west of the Portuguese territory, including the

districts now inhabited by the Mashonas, probably with great part of Matabele Land, and Umzila's dominions.

If this be so, the Jesuits have been led back, at the lapse of more than three centuries, to the very spot hallowed by the labours and death of one of their order, and may be said to enter on their mission as the heirs of the Portuguese martyr. Let us hope that the coincidence may be an augury of their success.

ART. II.—ENGLISH MEN OF LETTERS.

1. *English Men of Letters*. Edited by JOHN MORLEY. Macmillan & Co.
2. *Four Centuries of English Letters*. Edited and arranged by W. BAPTISTE SCOONES. C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.
3. *English Poets: Selections*. With Critical Introductions by various Writers, and a General Introduction by MATTHEW ARNOLD. Edited by THOMAS HUMPHRY WARD, M.A. In four volumes. Macmillan & Co. 1880.

THE stately tree of English Literature, so far as its age can be fixed, may be said to be of about five hundred years' growth. English poetry in particular, as distinguished from the "Rym dogerel" of the Romancers, which is not poetry, begins in the reign of Edward III. with Chaucer, styled by Occleve, his contemporary, "the finder of our fair language;" by Roger Ascham, "the English Homer;" by Spenser, "the pure wellhead of poetry," and "the well of English undefiled;" and by Dryden, "the father of English poetry." In him we must look for the roots of English literature, in so far as it is national and classical. After Crecy had been fought, after Poitiers had been won, after Langley wrote his "Vision of Piers Plowman," Chaucer far eclipsed that rhymester, as he afterwards eclipsed the "moral Gower" and his "Confessio Amantis." During more than thirty years, ending in 1400, he produced year after year his numerous poems, his "Book of the Duchess," "Troilus and Cressida," and the "Canterbury Tales." They were a new literary revelation flashing on the minds of men, and fully justify us in saying of their author that he is "the master who uses our language with a power, a freedom, a variety, a rhythmic beauty, that, in five centuries, not ten of his successors have been found able to rival."

Though English literature has been on the whole non-Catholic, it will be the object of this paper to remind the reader to what extent it has been modified by Catholic authors. It is, therefore, of the first importance to observe that it sprang up in Catholic

times, under Catholic sovereigns, and put forth its strength and promise, in a way never to be forgotten, in the person of Geoffrey Chaucer. He was, it is true, a secular poet in the main. His favourite themes were those of love, chivalry and romance—themes such as would have suited his contemporaries, Boccaccio and Petrarch—but in treating these he makes constant allusion to customs, beliefs and modes of speech essentially Catholic, and shows himself, moreover, to have been a religious man. Touching prayers and tender words of Christian warning often recur in his pages. The "Orison to the Holy Virgin," beginning "Mother of God and Virgin undefiled," is described as *Oratio Gallfridi Chaucer*; and in "La Prière de Notre Dame," translated by him from the French, we have a long address to the Blessed Virgin, in twenty-three stanzas, each of which begins with one of the letters of the alphabet, arranged in due succession. The actuality of Chaucer's Tales, in their representing so faithfully Catholic times and manners, contributed greatly to the charm they possessed in the eyes of Spenser, Dryden and Pope. In proportion as the ancient religion revives in England, the poetry of this great and genial singer will be read and prized in spite of the archaic, and now partly obsolete, language in which it is expressed. His works have given rise to a Chaucer-Literature, which was never more copious and flourishing than at present. The Society bearing his name, Mr. Furnivall its Director, Messrs. Skeat, Morris, Tyrwhitt, Bell, the Six-Text Edition of the "Canterbury Tales," Mr. Fleay, Mr. A. W. Ward and Mrs. Haweis, have done much towards making his poetry popular and his influence more widely felt. We can never forget that his works mark the settlement of the English tongue; that his rhymes and romances are full of pathos and humour, colour and fancy, abounding in detail, "with a sort of gorgeous idleness about their very length;"* and that he reflected men and manners in the mirror of his verse as none but Shakspeare has ever reflected them.

Let us pass over a score or so of years, barren of distinguished writers, and we arrive at the "Paston Letters," which bridge over the space that divides us from the Caxton press at Westminster and all its marvels. This collection of familiar letters, consisting of many hundreds, supplies, as Hallam said, "a precious link in the chain of the moral history of England." They aid us in tracing, not only the domestic, but the political and religious life of the kingdom, from 1422 to 1509. Almost all of them contain something which, either in thought or language, reminds us that they were written by Catholics in a Catholic land, and they lead

* "History of the English People," by J. R. Green, vol. i. p. 505.

us forward into the lifetime of an illustrious chancellor, author, and martyr to the Catholic faith, Sir Thomas More. They are becoming far better known, and more frequently consulted, since Mr. James Gairdner has given us so complete and clear an account of them, and the edition of 1875 has been published, containing 400 additional letters and many interesting documents not previously brought to light. With Sir Thomas More, his history and writings, our readers are already familiar. We claim him as a literary star, and an integral portion of English literature in its strictest sense. He represents and expounds the new learning of England. We are proud of his "Life of King Richard the Third," written with purity and clearness of style, and free from classical pedantry; his religious works abundantly bespeak his Catholic piety; and his "Utopia," revealing the heart of the new learning, touches problems of labour, crime, conscience and government, and anticipates many social and political discoveries of modern times. The building of cities, streets and houses, public health, the relations between rich and poor, apparel, the family, nursery and hospital, meals, recreations, travelling, education, philosophy, printing of books, war, marriage and religion, are all discussed in this remarkable work, not indeed without an admixture of very singular opinions here and there, but on the whole with great wisdom and forethought in advance of his age. A splendid edition of Robynson's translation of the original Latin has been published lately at Boston, Lincolnshire, with copious notes and an introduction,* giving the fullest evidence of the great and lasting influence of More as a Catholic member of the aristocracy of English Men of Letters.

Half a century after the death of Sir Thomas More, we light upon another martyr, who, like the Chancellor, made his mark as an author. The name of Robert Southwell will always be dear to English Catholics as that of one who died for his religion and theirs. They admire the fearless devotion which he displayed in undergoing cruel torture thirteen times, and finally obtaining the crown of martyrdom at Tyburn. His poems became popular in England soon after his heroic end, and "St. Peter's Complaint," first printed in 1595, was again and again re-issued in that year, and the immediately subsequent years. Mr. Hales, a very impartial critic, writing in the "Selections from English Poets," lately edited by Mr. T. H. Ward,† says:—

Apart from their attraction as revealing the secret of his much-enduring spirit, his poems show a true poetic power. They show a

* "Utopia." Edited by the Rev. T. F. Dibdin. Boston: Robert Roberts, 1878.

† Vol. i. p. 480.

rich and fertile fancy, with an abundant store of effective expression at its service. He inclines to sententiousness; but his sentences are no mere prose edicts, as is so often the case with writers of that sort; they are bright, and coloured with the light and the hues of a vivid imagination. In imagery, indeed, he is singularly opulent. In this respect "St. Peter's Complaint" reminds one curiously of the almost exactly contemporary poem, Shakespeare's "Lucrece." There is a like inexhaustibleness of illustrative resource. He delights to heap up metaphor on metaphor. . . . "St. Peter's Complaint" reminds one of "Lucrece" also in the minuteness of its narration, and in the unfailing abundance of thought and fancy with which every detail is treated. It is undoubtedly the work of a mind of no ordinary copiousness and force.

With regard to Shakspeare, it has been shewn by M. Rio,* and in a former number of this Review,† that he was probably a Catholic throughout life. M. Rio, indeed, felt wellnigh certain that it was so, and addressing the great dramatist, said: "To thy last sigh thou wast faithful to the religion of thy forefathers." The *Rambler* also endeavoured to establish the fact of Shakspeare's Catholicism.‡ The Rev. Richard Davies, who died in 1708, maintained that the poet "dyled a Papist," and his manuscript is preserved in Corpus Christi College, Oxford.§ If the evidence that can be produced on the subject is, after all, inconclusive, it is nevertheless certain that the style and spirit of his writings are uniformly respectful towards the virtues and offices of the Catholic Church; that "his whole soul was," as Mr. Knight said, "permeated with the ancient vitalities," and that there is nothing in his history to lead us to suppose that he was guilty of apostasy. "Catholicism," wrote Carlyle, "with and against Feudalism, but not against Nature and her bounty, gave us English a Shakspeare and era of Shakspeare, and so produced a blossom of Catholicism."|| His dramas and poems represent the entire body of English literature in this respect, that they are happily, and to a large extent, qualified by the presence of Catholic doctrines, precepts, habits, customs, associations; and the same may be said of his friend and rival, Ben Jonson, who was a Catholic at least during twelve years, and has left behind him very devout poems as well as the more popular ones, such as "Drink to me only with thine eyes." This admixture of Catholic with Protestant literature was of great advantage to the cause of the ancient faith, preserving it from total corruption and oblivion in the minds of Englishmen. It was a constant witness to truths once vital in the country, and a witness which

* "Shakspeare." Par. A. F. Rio. Paris: Donniol, 1864.

† January, 1865.

‡ 1854 and 1858. § *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, April, 1881, p. 236.

|| "French Revolution," vol i. p. 10.

increased in importance as time went on, and the study of literature became more frequent and more highly esteemed.

Sir William Davenant succeeded Ben Jonson as Poet Laureate in 1637, and it is remarkable that he, too, was a Catholic. We find him in that character in the service and favour of the Catholic Queen of Charles I., Henrietta Maria, in 1647. Though his works are but little read now, he must have had his influence in his time, and, together with Richard Crashaw, have thrown his weight as a man of letters into the Catholic scale. That this weight and influence on Crashaw's part was not inconsiderable, is evident from the following splendid epigram, which is often incorrectly quoted, on the Miracle of Cana in Galilee :—

Unde rubor vestris, et non sua purpura, lymphis ?

Quæ rosa mirantes tam nova mutat aquas ?

Numen, convivæ, præsens agnoscite numen,

Nympha pudica Deum vidit et erubuit.

What sudden purple in the water glows ?

Why has that clear lymph reddened like the rose ?

Lo, Christ is present ; every voice be hush'd :

The modest water saw its God and blush'd !

But a greater figure here stands before us—a figure, indeed, as great as any we shall meet with in the field of English literature. A passion for Dryden now would, indeed, be an acquired taste ; but so also must be a fondness for Chaucer, the early dramatists, or the highly-polished school of Pope. Every period of history has its own taste, especially in poetry, and we ourselves are already learning to look shyly on the poets who were the models of fifty years ago. But Dryden must have been “Glorious John” (as Halero always calls him in the “Pirate”), to those who lived near his time. His range was vast. He could write graceful lyrics, such as are scattered through his plays, or manœuvre with great skill the artillery of political satire. He could pursue lines of argument on Church matters in verse ; and the special pleader for Anglicanism in “Religio Laici” became afterwards the yet abler apologist of the Catholic Church in the “Hind and Panther.” As a tale-teller he followed worthily in the steps of Chaucer, and rendered some of his antiquated stories into the readable English verse of a later century. But Macaulay has endeavoured to mar his fame by throwing doubts on the sincerity of his conversion to the Catholic faith. In doing this, he set aside the judgment of men as eminent as Dr. Johnson and Sir Walter Scott, who had declared their conviction that Dryden was sincere. It is difficult to think that a mind of such grasp as that which gave birth to “Absalom and Achitophel” should have been capable of demeaning itself to such an extent as to change

a religion for the sake of some paltry reward and a prince's favour. Mr. Saintsbury and Mr. A. W. Ward, in their sketches of the poet's life, seem really to be advocating the common-sense view of the matter when they question the validity of Lord Macaulay and Mr. Green's charges against a man in whose character and writings the mark of nobility is by no means wanting. The latter writer is of opinion that the "*Religio Laici*" might almost be called a half-way house in the road along which Dryden was travelling. A reverence for authority was implanted in his nature." Though an Anglican when he wrote that poem, he seems to have been in a transition state when it was composed; and there are points in which it resembles the "*Tracts for the Times*," and other books of the Tractarian school, inasmuch as it contains admissions which, if pursued to their legitimate consequences, must result in submission to the Holy See. Hence, as Mr. A. W. Ward says,* "*His conversion finds sufficient explanation as a process natural to a mind and disposition constituted like his.*" Mr. Saintsbury argues in a like manner, and generously defends John Dryden from an abominable imputation. The more closely *The Hind and the Panther* is examined, the more internal evidence will it afford of the depth and breadth of the poet's intellectual conviction of the truth of Catholicism. Controversial writings, dogmatic treatises, councils and creeds, even if he had studied them, would hardly of themselves have enabled him to simulate a faith which he inwardly despised. The necessity of an authority which cannot err in matter of faith and morals, is the key note of the poem referred to, and evidently the dominant idea in the author's mind. He found in the Catholic Church that which he felt to be indispensable, and the want of which all the sects in Christendom pieced together could not supply.

Of her he was able to speak thus in his own peculiar and pointed language:—

One in herself, not rent by schism, but sound,
Entire, one solid shining diamond;
Not sparkles shattered into sects like you;
One is the Church, and must be to be true:
One central principle of unity;
As undivided, so from errors free;
As one in faith, so one in sanctity.
Thus she, and none but she, th'insulting rage
Of heretics opposed from age to age;
Still, when the giant-brood invades her throne,
She stoops from heaven and meets them half-way down,
And with paternal thunder vindicates her crown.

* "*The English Poets*" (Selections), vol. ii. p. 444.

In arguing in defence of the sincerity of this brilliant poet, it ought to be taken into account that he brought up his children in strong attachment to the ancient religion, and that in his correspondence he speaks of it calmly and decidedly as the religion of his conviction and choice. The language he uses in prose on this subject is precisely in accordance with the sentiments he delivers in stately and heroic verse—

If they will consider me, he wrote in November, 1699, as a man who has done my best to improve the language, and especially the poetry, and will be content with my acquiescence under the present government, and forbearing satire on it, that I can promise, because I can perform it; but I can neither take the oaths, nor forsake my religion; because I know not what Church to go to, if I leave the Catholique; they are all so divided amongst themselves in matters of faith necessary to salvation, and yet all assuming the name of Protestants. May God be pleased to open your eyes, as he has open'd mine! Truth is but one; and they who have once heard of it, can plead no excuse, if they do not embrace it. But these are things too serious for a trifling letter.

There is another literary man who deserves to be mentioned in this place, though, in consequence of the peculiar nature of his chief work, he has not attained the notoriety common to other men of letters. This is Thomas Ward, the author of "*England's Reformation, from the time of King Henry VIII. to the end of Oates's Plot.*"* The poem, which is well known to Catholics, and is not allowed to drop out of print, is far less known among Protestants. Nor is this surprising, since, written very much in the style of "*Hudibras*," it assails the Reformation with more than Hudibrastic ridicule and invective, depicting in the most ludicrous and lively manner the deeds and words of Protestant heroes and divines. But it is an appreciable factor in that modification of English literature by the Catholic element of which we have been speaking, and Ward must have had his personal as well as literary influence during his life. Born at Danby Castle, in Yorkshire, during the Commonwealth, he was brought to the Catholic faith by the study of Church History and the Holy Scriptures. His father disinherited him in favour of his mother and brethren, but these were afterwards converted to the faith by Thomas's instrumentality. At Rome he had the honour of serving five or six years in the Papal Guards, and in England he wrote various works of a controversial kind, and died in 1708, when Pope was a young man just entering into public life.

Of all the Catholics among us who have made an impression

* In four cantos. London: 1747.

on the literature of England, none has done it to so large an extent as Pope. This, however, did not happen in consequence of his faith, but rather in spite of it. The philosophy which he propounded in verse was derived from Bolingbroke rather than from the Schoolmen, yet he avoided coming into collision with mediæval doctrine; and sometimes, as in the *Epistle of Eloisa* to Abélard, his language and illustrations are in harmony with ideas and habits in vogue during the Middle Ages. He never attempted to conceal or dissemble his religion, and his friends, Bolingbroke, Harley, Addison, the Prince of Wales, Steele, Swift, Atterbury, Warburton, and Walpole were, in their intercourse with him, accustomed to allude to it as a fact which no one disputed. Sometimes it was the subject of a joke, at others of a reproach; and it never told in the poet's favour. It was an obstacle to the kind offices which they might have rendered him, at a time when authors especially needed such means of advancement. He was a member of a hated community, and tempted, therefore, to assume the indifference which alone could blunt the edge of hostility. To repeat words which we have used in another place—"Meeting a lady, one day, who invited him to her home, he asked whether she were not afraid of the law against harbouring Papists;" he wrote to Racine avowing his sincere Catholicism, and to Bishop Atterbury he wrote: "I am a Catholic in the strictest sense of the word." Writing to Dean Swift, he said, in 1729, "I am of the religion of Erasmus, a Catholic; so I live, so shall I die." Atterbury suggested that he should change his religion when his father died; but to this he would not listen. When he drew near to the confines of death, he said, "I am so certain of the soul's being immortal, that I seem to feel it within me, as it were, by intuition." He received the last sacraments, Mr. Leslie Stephen tells us, "with great fervour and resignation," and, according to Carruthers, the priest who administered them to him, "he came out from the dying man penetrated to the last degree with the state of mind in which he found his penitent, resigned and wrapt up in the love of God and man."

Among English Men of Letters there were not a few who subserved in different degrees and various ways the cause of Catholicism, though they were not themselves enrolled among its true and living members. Of the greatest of these something has already been said, but, besides Shakespeare, many others may be mentioned. Both before and after the time of William of Orange, writers on divinity who attained some distinction kept alive a belief in distinctive doctrines of the Catholic Church, which, but for their writings, would have fallen into more complete oblivion in this country. Among these are Hooker, Andrews, Hall, Laud, Pearson, Bull, Kenn, Beveridge, Dr. Johnson,

Bingham, Horne, Horsley, Heber, and other nonjuring or High Church clergymen. Some of these, it is true, scarcely answer to what is generally understood by men of letters, but there are others to whom it applies strictly and in all its fulness. It was in the school of such writers that the theological views of Pusey, Keble and Newman were formed. Without them and their works the "Tracts for the Times" would never have appeared, the large accession to the ranks of the Church from Anglicanism would not have taken place, the Catholic hierarchy in England would not have been restored, nor would the condition of Catholics here, politically, socially or religiously, be at all like what it has become. It needs only to refer to the *Catena Patrum* in the "Tracts for the Times"* to confirm what is here asserted. The novels of Sir Walter Scott have, on the whole, contributed towards the revival of Catholic sympathies, in consequence of their carrying back the minds of readers to periods, events, customs and associations peculiarly Catholic. They tended in a multitude of ways to make Catholicism respectable, interesting, and even grand in the eyes of a vast number who had previously regarded it with indifference or scorn; and to this day parish priests are glad to receive presents of Scott's complete works for the use of parochial lending libraries. The taste for æstheticism which they engender is entirely in harmony with the religion of the Middle Ages.

Born of Catholic parents, and educated in early years in their faith, Thomas Moore allowed himself in after-life to be drawn aside into partial, if not entire, conformity to the established religion. Yet, even amid these unworthy concessions, he ever and anon reverted to the creed of his childhood, either in his writings or by his actions. Sometimes he would be seen assisting at the holy sacrifice of the Mass, or even appearing before the world as a defender of the Catholic faith. If his good works in these respects were insufficient to clear his character as an orthodox Christian from reproach, they at all events threw a portion of his influence on the side of the faith which had been cherished in his own country through so many ages of bitter suffering. There is a tendency now in the higher walks of literature to deny his poetry that merit to which it once laid undisputed claim; but there are some of his sacred melodies which must ever hold a high rank as religious poetry, and can never fade from the memory of his admirers. Of all his works, the "Sacred Songs," published in 1816, are the most beautiful and tender, though by no means the best known.

His marriage with a Protestant lady was followed by the bringing up of his children in the religion of their mother; yet, if

* Vol. iii. No. 74, 1835-6.

Moore himself was a lax Catholic, he was certainly a very indifferent Protestant. He advised his sister Kate *not* to declare herself a Protestant, but to remain quietly in the religion of her childhood. Lord Lansdowne said to him one day (August 20, 1825): "They (some reviewers) take you for a Catholic;" to which the poet replied that "they had but too much right to do so." In one of his conversations with Lord John, afterwards Earl, Russell, he talked about his forthcoming book, the "Travels of an Irish Gentleman in search of a Religion," and explained to him the nature of it, adding that he had not the least doubt in his own mind of the truth of the case he undertook to prove in it—namely, "that Popery is in all respects the old, original Christianity, and Protestantism a departure from it." Moore expressed the same conviction more fully in his *Diary* under the date of November 2 to 9, 1834. On June 22, 1823, he wrote: "Before driving out, had gone with Edward (Moore) to Warwick (Catholic) chapel, where we heard the latter part of the service, and most solemn and touching it was. It seemed to come with more effect over me, after the restless and feverish life I have been leading; and brought tears instantly from the very depths of my heart." He writes in a similar strain in his *Journal*, December 18, 1825; and his words remind us of the lines in one of his "Sacred Melodies":—

Go, let me weep, there's bliss in tears
 When he who sheds them inly feels
 Some lingering stain of early years
 Effaced by every drop that steals.

It cannot, indeed, be denied that many, if not most, of the writers whose Catholic faith or tendencies have here been described, have left behind them a great deal of impropriety. But for this fact, which it would be in vain to attempt to conceal, some excuse may be offered. They were probably writing at a period when far less delicacy and refinement of language was required in compositions, especially those intended for the stage, than is now thought indispensable: and in some instances, though they were coarse, their coarseness was not immodest. The English nation was no better and no worse than other nations of Europe in this respect. Even in the Italian hymns of Jacopone da Todi, and others in the fourteenth century, we are constantly meeting with crude carnal metaphors such as a decent London publisher would not tolerate in our day. Loud complaints have been made of Dryden especially, and of the dramas he wrote after his conversion; but without denying that there is some ground of complaint, censors have to be reminded

that neither he nor any other old English writer ought to be judged by the standard of propriety recognized at the present time.

At the time when Lingard's "History of England" first appeared—in the early part of 1819—English Catholics were, as a body, deficient in learning, little known and generally despised. It was therefore little expected that the priest of a secluded mission at Hornby would write a history of his country, replete with the profoundest knowledge, classical in style, veracious, impartial, yet rectifying numerous errors, and of a nature to change the face of future English history, and give to it a new colour and direction. Still less did it seem likely that this work would become a favourite with the public, both Catholic and Protestant; that it would be praised by the best critics, and imitated by the ablest annalists; that it would be recognized as a standard book, without which no library would be complete; prove largely profitable to the author; and be eventually the occasion of his receiving a pension from the Queen of England. For the first two editions of the work the author had, altogether, £4,133, and the satisfaction of seeing it translated into several European languages. He has greatly influenced subsequent historians, and introduced, to a far higher extent than it had previously been practised, the habit of referring to original documents and archives of State. Miss Strickland owed much to Lingard, and followed in his wake in her history of the "Queens of England." He imposed on himself the honourable task of taking nothing on credit, but of going to the original author. He made it a rule also, as he said in a letter to Mr. Kirk, to tell the truth whether it made for or against his own side, and to avoid all appearance of controversy. He felt sure that his only chance of gaining the ear of Protestants at that time was by writing as an indifferent spectator, and experience has shown that his plan was a wise one. It helped materially to give him a permanent place among the English classics, and to procure him, during life, the familiar acquaintance of persons of distinction, such as Brougham, Scarlett and Pollock, who, when leading men at the bar, frequently went over from Lancaster to Hornby, on a Sunday or other holiday, to pass it in Lingard's company.

There have not been wanting English men of letters who, while firmly adhering to Protestantism in the general tone of their writings, have now and then given partial aid to the Catholic cause by compositions of singular beauty, in which Catholic doctrine or practice was either exhibited or defended, or both. Among these we may reckon Wordsworth, of whom so beautiful a sketch has been written by Mr. W. F. H. Myers, in the series edited by Mr. John Morley. Although in his

"Ecclesiastical Sonnets" he puts forward commonly those views of the Reformation which are in favour among Protestants, he sometimes rises above the prejudices of his age, and breathes the language of ancient piety. The virtues that found noble exercise in the Crusades, and were fostered by the monastic system, are not altogether lost on him; and he is Christian and poet enough to feel transported with the love and purity of the spotless maid of Nazareth. The lines that follow have often been quoted, but can we become too familiar with them? Can we set in the frame of memory a higher gem than this sonnet?—

Mother! whose virgin bosom was uncrust
 With the least shade of thought to sin allied;
 Woman above all women glorified,
 Our tainted nature's solitary boast;
 Purer than foam on central ocean tost;
 Brighter than eastern skies at daybreak strewn
 With fancied roses, than the unblemished moon
 Before her wane begins on heaven's blue coast,
 Thy image falls to earth. Yet some, I ween,
 Not unforgiven the suppliant knee might bend
 As to a visible Power, in which did blend
 All that was mixed and reconciled in thee
 Of mother's love with maiden purity,
 Of high with low, celestial with terrene!

The thought of Wordsworth, by a kind of contrecoup, suggests that of Byron. An anonymous writer in the *Tablet*, about a year ago,* speaking of his religious opinions, said: "They are of value, not only as affording evidence of the direction in which his noble, though abused intellect was tending, but also because they are an illustration of the power of Catholic truth over minds the most unsuspected of submission to its influence. I have often thought that a catena of authorities in favour of Catholic doctrines might be formed out of the writings of non-Catholics, and even infidels." Another correspondent of the same periodical† speaks of "the respect with which the great poet regarded the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church," and in illustration of this respect he cites several anecdotes. In a letter from Fletcher, Lord Byron's valet, to Dr. Kennedy, published in the Appendix to Galt's life of the poet, we find,—

At another time, I remember it well, being a Friday, I at the moment not remembering it, said to my lord: "Will you have a fine plate of beccaficas?" My lord, half in anger, replied: "Is not this Friday? how could you be so extremely lost to your duty to make such a request of me?" at the same time saying: "A man that

* "D.," Oct. 9, 1880.

† Joseph M. Star, Sept. 24, 1880.

can so far forget a duty as a Christian, who cannot for one day in seven forbid himself of those luxuries, is no longer worthy to be called a Christian. In the year 1817, I have seen my lord repeatedly, on meeting or passing any religious ceremonies which the Roman Catholics have in their frequent processions, while at Nivia, near Venice, dismount his horse and fall on his knees, and remain in that posture till the procession had passed; and one of his grooms, who was backward in following the example of his lordship, my lord gave a violent reproof to. The man in his defence said, "I am no Catholic, and by this means thought I ought not to follow any of their ways." My lord answered very sharply upon the subject, saying, "Nor am I a Catholic, but a Christian, which I should not be, were I to make the same objections which you make."

It was quite in accordance with these sentiments that Byron removed his daughter, Allegra, from the care of the Shelleys, and caused her to be educated as "a strict Catholic in a convent of Romagna." "It is my wish," he wrote to Moore, in April, 1821, that she should be a Roman Catholic, which I look upon as the best religion, as it is assuredly the oldest of the various branches of Christianity." On another occasion he wrote to the same friend: "I think people can never have enough of religion if they are to have any. I incline myself very much to the Catholic doctrines." And again, a few days later:—"I am really a great admirer of tangible religion, and am breeding one of my daughters a Catholic, that she may have her hands full. It is by far the most elegant worship, hardly excepting the Greek mythology. What with incense, pictures, statues, altars, shrines, relics, and the real Presence, confession, absolution, there is something to grasp at. . . . I am afraid that this sounds flippant, but I don't mean it to be so. . . . I do assure you that I am a very good Christian." He wrote to Murray also, April 9, 1817: "When I turn thirty I will turn devout; I feel a great vocation that way in Catholic Churches and when I hear the organ."

Mr. Nichol, in his "Life of Byron," in the "English Men of Letters," speaks of the well-known stanzas beginning—

Ave Maria, blessed be the hour,

as one of the most musical, and seemingly heartfelt, hymns in the language.

Amid all the fire and passion of Byron's poetry and correspondence, there are not wanting passages that betray a spirit of prayer and a recognition of the Divine will. "God grant me," he wrote,* "some judgment to do what may be most fitting in that (making more poetry) and everything else, for I doubt my own exceedingly." "God grant us all better times, or more philo-

* Sept. 15, 1817.

sophy!" he wrote again in 1821.* When Allegra, the daughter he had placed in a convent for education, passed away from earth, he said: *Ella è più felice di noi Dio ha voluto così—Non ne parliamo più!* In the account given of his last moment, by Thomas Moore, we learn that he said: "It is too late; all is over." "I hope not," answered Fletcher; "but the Lord's will be done!" "Yes, not mine," said Byron. A writer in the *Guardian*† quotes the following passage from *Temple Bar*. "A crucifix was found under the death-bed pillow of the hardened cynic, Byron. . . . Byron was always superstitious, and his cynicism was certainly not connected with unbelief. Once, in company with Shelley (at Venice, I think), he horrified his companion by kneeling when a religious procession went by."

The force, humour and even pathos with which Byron advocated the claims of the Catholics to Emancipation in the House of Lords, may be regarded as bearing on this subject. It showed a leaning towards the Catholic cause in youth, at least in so far as that cause was political; and it blends with that more definite tendency to Catholicism as the most ancient and best religious system, which Byron, in the midst of his follies and passions, manifested in later life. It is by such leanings and tendencies that the general hostility of English literary men to the Catholic faith has, ever since the "Reformation," been happily modified in several remarkable instances. The way has thus been left open for future argument, and some common ground has been retained for anti-Protestant disputations.

The literary change effected by the direct and indirect action of the Oxford school of divinity was very great. It flooded the land with literature such as had previously been almost unknown—literature relying for its interest and influence on early ecclesiastical history, sacramental rites and the ages of faith. Fiction and poetry acquired new features, and the "*Lyra Apostolica*," taking especially the treatment of the ethical side of Christianity, united the efforts of a small band of men, of whom several became famous in the literary world. None of these has exerted a wider influence than the Rev. John Keble, then Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. The "*Christian Year*" operated, and operates still, chiefly within the limits of the Anglican communion, which is its natural home. Being specially adapted to the Sundays and Festivals of the Christian year as observed in the Established Church in accordance with the Book of Common Prayer, it had little or no tendency to extend the bounds of Anglicanism, and lead its readers onward to the confines of Rome. It did, however,

* Jan. 11, 1821.

† "G. C. M." *Guardian*, Sept. 15, 1880.

in one poem, "The Annunciation," evince a sense of the purity and dignity of the Blessed Mother of our Lord, quite unusual at that time among Anglicans, and addressed her with—

Ave Maria! Thou whose name
All but adoring love may claim.

In another volume of poems, less popular than "The Christian Year," Keble seemed as of set purpose—though it was not really his intention—to smooth away the chief obstacle which stood in their way in advancing towards reconciliation to the Holy See. The place held by Saint Mary in the economy of divine grace, as understood by Catholics, appeared to Anglican High Churchmen in general to be at variance with the simplicity of the Gospel, derogatory to the supreme dignity of Christ, and unsanctioned by the practice of the early Church. The poem, however, just referred to, and an elaborate note appended to it, indicated an opposite view, and might be taken, whether it was intended to be so or not, as a justification of the system of worship established by long usage in the Catholic Church. After describing the miraculous steps of sacramental grace in the course of Church rites, it asked :—

What is this silent might, making our darkness light,
New wine our waters, heavenly Blood our wine?
Christ with His mother dear, and all His saints, is here,
And where they dwell is Heaven, and what they touch, divine.

And to this was added, in a note :—

The change of water into wine was believed by the ancients to typify that change which St. Paul in particular so earnestly dwells on : "Old things are passed away : behold all things are become new." And St. John : "He that sitteth on the throne saith, Behold I make all things new." Accordingly, St. Cyprian applies this first miracle to the admission of the Gentiles into the Church (Ep. 63 ed. Fell). And St. Augustine, to the evangelical interpretation of the Old Testament. (In Joan. Tract. 8). And St. Cyril, of Alexandria (in loc.) to the spirit superseding the letter. This, then, being the "beginning of miracles," a kind of pattern of the rest, showing how Christ's glory was to be reached in the effects of His Sacramental Touch ; whether immediately, as when He touched the leper and healed him : or through the hem of His garment : or by Saints, His living members, according to His Promise, "The works that I do shall ye do also : and greater works than these shall ye do, because I go unto my Father." Thus, according to the Scriptures, the Sacramental Touch of the Church is the Touch of Christ : and her system is "deifica disciplina," a rule which, in some sense, makes men Gods, and the human divine ; and all this depends on the verity of the Incarnation ; therefore *His Mother is especially instrumental in it* ; besides being, as nearest to Him, the most glorious instance of it. "*The Mother of Jesus is there, and both*

Jesus and His Disciples are called—He as the Bridegroom and Author of the whole mystery; they as ministers, servants and instruments)—to this mysterious “marriage,” or Communion of Saints.

Though little mention at first was made of this note, its effect was enormous. To the more thoughtful among Keble’s admirers it appeared to underlie, and to be intended to embrace and justify, the position held by the blessed Mother of our Lord in the practical system of the Roman Church. She is “especially instrumental” in the economy of grace, as she was in the miracle of Cana in Galilee—this is the lesson he teaches. He makes no distinction between the present and the past: what she was at Cana of Galilee, that she was at the foot of the Cross, and during the forty days, and in the upper chamber on the day of Pentecost, and that she is now—a great mediatrix with her Son, by virtue of His grace and her own sacred and mysterious maternity! The greatest obstacle which had stood in the way of many among them seemed to be removed, and the language of the Litany of Loretto to adapt itself easily to their lips.

It would be endless to endeavour to trace thoroughly the diffusion of Catholic doctrine in England by Protestant writers and in literary channels since the appearance of Keble’s “*Lyra Innocentium*.” The pages of this Review since its commencement would supply abundant and continuous proof of its reality and extent. There was another leader of the Oxford movement, greater than Keble, who would never have obtained that immense influence which is still in course of evolution, if he had not been, in addition to his other gifts and acquirements, a literary man. And it is well that it was so. It would have been a great misfortune if either the Oxford movement itself, or the Catholic revival in which it resulted, had been inoculated with a contempt of letters. The Church has ever encouraged the study of Eastern, Greek and Roman classic literature because, if for no other reason, each of these has so direct a bearing on the sacred literature with which she is more especially concerned. None but enthusiasts would restrict the mental culture of Christians; and Catholicism favours letters, now even more than it was wont to do in the days of Langland, Chaucer and Sir John Mandeville. In our schools and colleges an acquaintance with English literature is not only encouraged but required, though we are painfully sensible of the large admixture of filth and corruption with which its waters have, during three centuries, passed through the land. Even the series of “*English Men of Letters*,” which stands first among the books at the head of this paper, in spite of its extraordinary merits, is not such as we can thoroughly commend. The treatment of the lives and writings of several English authors has been entrusted to decided Positivists; and though they have

written with considerable self-restraint, their volumes cannot but exert an influence unfavourable to Christianity. The literary ability of the volumes on Bunyan, Burke, Hume, Locke, Gibbon, and Shelley, written respectively by Mr. J. A. Froude, Mr. John Morley, Professor Huxley, Professor Fowler, Mr. J. Cotter Morison, and Mr. J. Addington Symonds, does not prevent our regretting, not so much what they insert in their pages, as what they omit to insert. The monograph on Cowper by Mr. Goldwin Smith is defective in its appreciation of his poetry, and in sympathy with his afflicted and deeply religious interior life. "Sir Walter Scott," by Mr. H. Hutton, contains much independent criticism of Scott's writings, character and actions, and may be read with pleasure, even after Lockhart. Nor is Professor Nichols on Byron by any means superfluous, though we had before that of Mr. Nichols so many biographies of the man whom Matthew Arnold terms "the greatest natural force, the greatest elementary power, which has appeared in our literature since Shakspeare.*" As to Samuel Johnson, one never tires of reading about him, and certainly Mr. Leslie Stephen will not cause us to do so. Professor Shairp reviews Robert Burns with as much upright moral principle as correct taste and poetic feeling. In "Thackeray" and "Hawthorne" we have novelists appreciated by novelists. Dean Church has brought his great ability to bear on Spenser's life and poetry; and the Rev. Mark Pattison's book on Milton teems with signs of acute and accurate observation. "Chaucer," "Dryden" and "Daniel Defoe" are very remarkable for the condensed view of three distinct periods of English literature which their respective authors, Mr. A. W. Ward, Mr. George Saintsbury, and Mr. William Minto have given. Mr. F. W. H. Myers' biographical sketch of Wordsworth is a masterpiece of criticism, taste and feeling. Southey and his works are made as interesting as they can be made by Mr. Edward Dowden. Pope and his "*mens curva in corpore curvo*," to use Atterbury's expression, are amply discussed by Mr. Leslie Stephen, and perhaps no very unfair picture is drawn. Goldsmith, always delightfully interesting, is not less so than usual in the hands of Mr. William Black. The sketch of Walter Savage Landor, issued in July, 1881, and written by Mr. Sidney Colvin, the Slade Professor of Fine Art at Cambridge, is a sympathetic review of Landor's long career and classical writings. The "marble" beauty of the "Imaginary Conversations" is brought into prominent notice, and much is done to heighten the general estimate of Landor's sedate, polished and Hellenic style. On the other hand, his republican principles are stript bare, and the fact

* "Essays in Criticism," quoted in "Passages from Prose Writings," p. 45.

that, in his eyes, nearly all kings were tyrants to be removed by the dagger or the rope. These are all the sketches of "English Men of Letters" that have hitherto appeared, and they form a brilliant and attractive introduction to the study of English literature, so far as they go. We should have rejoiced if the writers had been more decidedly Christian in their general tone, while at the same time we admit that they often exhibit great impartiality, and are always careful not to give offence.

The "Four Centuries of English Letters" is a most valuable assistant to all who are bent on acquiring a knowledge of the national Literature. It consists of selections from the correspondence of one hundred and fifty writers, from the period of the "Paston Letters" (A.D. 1422 to 1509) to the present day. They are arranged chronologically, according to the date of each author's birth, and each letter is preceded by a critical or explanatory head-note, worded in as condensed a form as possible. Great care has been taken to choose such epistles as are thoroughly representative of the writer and his times. There are in all 351; and it is certain that no other collection of the kind can be found having equal claims on our attention. The book is an unfailing source of amusement and instruction. It might, no doubt, have included a much larger number of epistles, but perhaps not with advantage. It points to the best epistolary writings our language can boast. It might have inserted Nicholas Breakspear's letter to Henry II., when the mendicant of Abbots Langley, in Hertfordshire, had attained to the Papal tiara. It might have given a specimen or two of the letters of Father Fitz Simon, Bishop Doyle and James Hinton. But we are too well pleased with the book to make complaints. The editor, Mr. W. Baptiste Scoones, has shown remarkable discretion, and has in the Preface given satisfactory reasons for his omission, generally speaking, of political letters.

In the four volumes of selections from the English poets we are invited to trace the stream of verse from Chaucer to our own times, without, however, including the poets still alive. The Editor takes a very high standard of poetry, as something which is "to interpret life for us, to console us and to sustain us." But this is expecting more of it than it ever has or can perform. It is true, not of poetry in general, but only of the highest and best. Mr. Ward has spared no pains to make the best selection possible, and has succeeded better than his predecessors. Volumes of elegant extracts from the poets used to be very unsatisfactory before the appearance of Palgrave's "Golden Treasury;" and even since then they have all fallen far short of Mr. Ward's systematic plan. The selection of pieces from each poet has been entrusted to some literary man of distinction, who has written on that

particular poet, or in some way proved his special aptitude for dealing with his works. Each set of extracts is preceded by a short introductory essay. Those on Gower, Lydgate and Occleve are by Mr. Thomas Arnold, whose work on "English Literature" entitles him to be heard. We may not always agree with the original views taken by some of the writers. We may think Mr. Swinburne, for example, extravagant in some of his remarks on Collins, and that he is carried away at times by overwrought and capricious admiration, yet we cannot but feel that the introductory remarks, taken one with another, form a digest of criticism on the English poets in which the wisest and most highly cultured may find much to learn and admire. The volumes bring before us the collected wisdom of the best living critics; and side by side with their critiques we have, in the several extracts, the means of judging for ourselves of the accuracy and worth of their observations.

JOHN CHARLES EARLE, B.A. Oxon.

ART. III.—PHILOSOPHY OF THE THEISTIC CONTROVERSY.

THROUGHOUT our present series of articles we have explained that, whereas our affirmative argument for Theism will be such (we hope) as to hold its own against all gainsayers, the opponents, nevertheless, whom we directly assail, are those only of one particular school. We do not directly encounter Hegelians and Pantheists, but only Phenomenists and Agnostics. This statement must of course be understood with obvious qualifications: we cannot, *e.g.*, establish the existence of a Personal God, without replying to whatever objections are raised by the Pantheist. But we shall not directly criticize the spirit and teaching of any Antitheistic school, except only that which proceeds on the lines of Phenomenism, and which opposes Theism in the name of Inductive Philosophy. No other Antitheistic school has large influence in England; nor again (as we shall point out in the sequel) is any other so fundamentally and obtrusively opposed to religion, in regard to the very meaning and due conduct of life. When we began our series in 1871, we dealt with Mr. Stuart Mill, as representing this school; for he was its acknowledged leader and most typical specimen. Since his death, however, not only his philosophical reputation has declined in quite an extraordinary degree;—but (which is partly no doubt the cause of that declension) his posthumous "Essays

on Religion" have exhibited one or two most remarkable instances of hesitation in carrying out his principles to their full and legitimate issue. On the present occasion, therefore, and hereafter, we shall treat him as one only out of many, and refer to those only of his utterances which are common to him with all Phenomenists.

The purpose of our present article (we may say briefly) is to exhibit in their mutual relation these two antagonistic doctrines of Theism and Phenomenistic Antitheism. We hope first to summarize and emphasize what we have said on former occasions, concerning the intellectual inanity, or rather self-contradictoriness, of Antitheistic Phenomenism in the shape which it now assumes. We hope next to consider what are the reasons of that profound antipathy to Theism, which is so conspicuous in the adherents of Phenomenism: for this is of course an absolutely necessary inquiry, if we are to fight against its adherents with any hope of success. We hope, lastly, to exhibit a catalogue of those arguments for Theism which we shall successively enforce in future articles; to indicate their general character; and to exhibit their ground of conclusiveness. We begin, then, with the first of these three themes.

It was a remarkable characteristic of Mr. Stuart Mill, that he invariably treated his opponents, not with courtesy only, but with kindness and generosity. Dr. Bain, also (we must say), is uniformly courteous and respectful in his language. But such habits are far from universal among living members of the school. Thus, Professor Huxley—as quoted in the *Tablet* of Aug. 20, 1881—says of those who believe that God created the universe, that "they have not reached that state of emergence from ignorance, in which the necessity of a discipline to enable them to be judges has, as yet, dawned on the mind." Here is bounce and swagger with a vengeance: no Christian then possesses even the rudiments of due mental discipline. Without calling into question the Professor's possession of due mental discipline, we shall nevertheless contend that the philosophical system which he maintains is so feeble and self-contradictory, as to be destitute of all claim on the slightest intellectual respect.

We here speak of Phenomenists (be it observed) as philosophers, not as scientists. We heartily admit that innumerable truths of great importance have been established by inductive science; and that no men have laboured more ably and more successfully in the vineyard of inductive science, than these our opponents. So far we have, of course, no quarrel with them whatever; and would only point out that many others have wrought with equal success in the same field, who have been firm believers in Religious Doctrine. But Professor Huxley and his sympathizers are not

content with holding that the processes of inductive science are reasonable and legitimate: they take an all-important step farther. According to them, the fact that inductive processes are legitimate suffices to establish a certain philosophical tenet, which we call Phenomenism. And they then set forth a further premiss, with which we entirely concur—viz., that, if this tenet be true, man has no means of knowing God's Existence. We entirely admit, then, that Phenomenism is Antitheistic; but we maintain that (as held by them) it is most manifestly false and self-contradictory.

What, then, is Phenomenism? Nothing can be more easily understood by any one who will use his mind, than the distinction between this tenet and its contradictory, Intuitionism. The Phenomenist, as such, professes to build his intellectual fabric exclusively on "experienced facts"; to accept nothing except some experienced fact, as a first premiss in argument, as a truth immediately known. It is by so comporting himself, that he thinks he sympathizes with the true spirit of inductive science; and guards against the evil habit so common among other philosophers, the erecting gratuitously into the rank of objective truths what are merely impressions of the speculator's own mind.* On the other hand, the Intuitionist alleges that there are various truths, immediately evident and admissible therefore as primary premisses, which are in no sense "experienced facts." These he calls "truths of intuition." Accordingly we have, on former occasions, defined an "intuition" to be "an intellectual avouchment, reliably declaring as immediately certain some truth, other than the mere existence and characteristics of such avouchment." The Intuitionist considers accordingly, that these "truths of intuition" are no less immediately certain—no less trustworthy as primary sources of knowledge—than are experienced facts themselves.

* "The notion that truths external to the mind may be known by intuition, independently of observation and experience, is (I am persuaded) for these times the great intellectual support of false doctrines and bad intentions. By the aid of this theory every inveterate belief and every intense feeling, of which the origin is not remembered, is enabled to dispense with the obligation of justifying itself by reason, and is erected into its own all-sufficient justification. There never was such an instrument devised for consecrating all deep-seated prejudices."—STUART MILL'S *Autobiography*, pp. 225-226.

"The difference between these two schools of Philosophy—that of Intuition and of Experience and Association—lies at the foundation of all the greatest differences of practical opinion in our age of progress."—*Ib.* p. 273.

Certain persons "addict themselves with intolerant zeal to those forms of philosophy, in which intuition usurps the place of evidence, and internal feeling is made the test of objective truth."—*Essays on Religion*, p. 72.

We said just now that Phenomenism—as held by the contemporary school of Antitheistic Phenomenists—is most manifestly false and self-contradictory. What we meant was, that if Phenomenists were true to their characteristic tenet—if they honestly and consistently held to their principle, that experienced facts are the exclusive basis of real knowledge—they would commit philosophical suicide; they would contradict those affirmations, to which they have committed themselves most confidently and unanimously. This is to be our first ground of attack.

They consider that the strongest and most irresistible proof of the Phenomenistic tenet is to be found in the marvels wrought by inductive science. "Inductive science," they say, "has achieved its incredible successes, precisely by its stern rejection of all first premisses except experienced facts." Now, Dr. Bain ("Deductive Logic," p. 273) points out what is very obvious—viz., that "the guarantee, the ultimate* major premiss of all induction," is "nature's uniformity." And we are now going to argue, that this first premiss of all induction—the premiss, without which no experienced fact can have the slightest scientific value—that this premiss is itself quite incapable of being proved on the exclusive basis of experienced facts. But, if this our thesis be established, it follows that "the stern rejection of all first premisses except experienced facts" not only is not the characteristic of inductive science, but on the contrary would be the absolute destruction of that science. We proceed at once to develop this argument.

What do Dr. Bain and his sympathizers understand by the phrase "nature's uniformity"? They mean (1) that no phenomenon ever takes place without a corresponding phenomenal antecedent; and (2) that any given phenomenal antecedent is invariably and unconditionally followed by the same phenomenal consequent. It is their own emphatic statement, that the uniformity of nature—understood in this precise sense—is absolutely essential as a foundation for inductive science. Suppose it were possible, *e.g.*, that I should compose a substance to-day of certain materials, and find it by experience to be combustible; while I might compose another to-morrow of the very same materials, united in the very same way, in the very same proportions, and by experience find the composition *incombustible*. If such a case were possible, argues the Phenomenist, the whole foundation of inductive science would be taken from under my feet.†

* Should not this word rather be "primary"?

† We do not ourselves admit that the uniformity of nature is by any means so complete as Phenomenists consider. Their statement, indeed, as it stands, is directly anti-religious; it denies the existence of Free Will and of miracles, and it virtually denies also the efficacy of prayer,

Belief, then, in the uniformity of nature is admitted by Phenomenists themselves to be an absolutely essential condition, for the prosecution of inductive science.

The first question, then, we ask them is, by what right they *assume* this fact of nature's uniformity? How can they prove—unless they admit intuitive premisses—that phenomena throughout the universe do proceed with that undeviating regularity which their science requires? Mr. Stuart Mill, in controversy with ourselves, professed to give such a proof as we challenged; but his argument was so flimsy, that we had difficulty in believing him really to have given his mind to the subject. The last word of the discussion may be seen in our number for January, 1874, pp. 33–38. Dr. Bain, on the contrary, frankly admits that no such argument is forthcoming; and that the fact of nature's uniformity must be taken for granted without any proof whatever. (See his "*Deductive Logic*," p. 273). "We can give no reason or evidence," he says, "for this uniformity." For our own part, however, we are disposed to admit, that the *present* uniformity of phenomenal sequence may be inferred from experienced facts—not indeed with certainty, but with very considerable probability. Inductive science proceeds on this basis; and in these modern centuries its fecundity has been marvellous indeed. The supposition is certainly improbable in a very high degree, that investigations, proceeding on a thoroughly false basis, can have issued in so vast a multitude of entirely unexpected, yet experimentally verified, conclusions. The incredibly rapid progress, then, of inductive science has endued with a rapidly increasing degree of probability the fundamental principle on which that science rests—viz., the uniformity of phenomenal sequence. We should, indeed, confidently maintain that even such an argument

whether offered for temporal blessings, or for strength against temptation, or for progress in virtue. We set forth at sufficient length what we here mean, in an article (April, 1867) called, "*Science, Prayer, Free Will, and Miracles*," which we have quite recently republished. In that article—while we protest vigorously against any such sweeping proposition concerning the extent of nature's uniformity as Phenomenists love to set forth—we entirely admit, nevertheless, and maintain, that there does exist a certain very extensive uniformity throughout the phenomenal world. We consider indeed that both Free Will and Miracles constitute a very large exception to that uniformity; and we consider also that God is ever premoving and stimulating the natural action of natural forces, in the direction marked out by His Providence. But a very large area of uniformity still remains, and one (we maintain) which amply suffices as a basis of solid induction.

In our present article, our argument does not require that we dwell at greater length on this particular divergence between Phenomenists and ourselves; and we shall accept, therefore, for argument's sake and without further protest, their understanding of the term "nature's uniformity."

as we have here given possesses no real validity, except by the help of this or that implicit intuition, which men unconsciously and irresistibly assume as genuine. This, however, is a question on which we shall not now insist, because we wish here to content ourselves with the broadest and most palpable considerations. We will willingly admit, therefore, for argument's sake, that the modern progress of inductive science has enabled the Phenomenist, consistently with his own principles, to regard the *present* uniformity of nature as sufficiently established.

But now it is manifest on the surface, that these grounds of probability (whatever their value) apply exclusively to what may be called the *scientific epoch*. Go back three thousand years (not to speak of an indefinitely more recent period), there was no assemblage of facts, discovered by careful processes of induction; nor any persistent exploration of nature. Phenomenists declare that they will accept no conclusion, unless it be rigidly deduced from experienced facts. What facts in the world are there to which they can point as premisses for the conclusion, that uniform phenomenal sequence existed three thousand years ago? If *experienced facts* were all the premisses on which the argument could reasonably proceed, there is hardly so much as a preponderance of probability for the conclusion, that nature's uniformity existed then as it exists now. Assuredly, the notion of there being any approximation to *certainty* on the matter is absolutely childish. Yet Phenomenists—in their whole argumentation concerning creation, evolution, and similar themes—invariably assume, as a matter of course, that the laws of nature proceeded during thousands (not to say millions) of years ago, with the same regularity and uniformity with which they proceed now. Was there ever poorer and more paltry child's play than this? Let it be carefully observed, that we are not here attempting any inquiry whatever, direct or indirect, how far *intuitive* premisses may be producible, which shall suffice for establishing the past uniformity of nature: we are but criticising these repudiators of intuition, these devotees of experienced facts. And it is really too absurd, when one finds them ridiculing with lofty contempt the dogma, *e.g.*, of creation; and resting their criticism on no stronger basis, than their extravagant assumption—extravagant (that is) on *their* principles—concerning the laws of nature in time past. In fact, their argument is exactly like what is uncomplimentarily called a lady's reason: "It is, because it is." "We hold firmly that creation never took place." "Why?" "Because the laws of nature always existed." "On what ground do you hold that these laws always existed?" "Because otherwise it might be necessary to admit the dogma of creation."

And if (on Phenomenistic principles) there is such very slender probability for the statement that nature proceeded uniformly throughout time past,—what shall we say of the statement that nature will proceed uniformly in time *future*? Yet, as Dr. Bain himself observes, “all our interest is concentrated on what is yet to be: the present and past are of no value, except only as a clue to the events that are to come” (“Deductive Logic,” p. 273). The processes of induction lose their whole practical use, unless there be assurance that the laws of nature will be hereafter the same which they now are. But to say (as the Phenomenist must consistently say) that *experienced facts* can afford assurance for this, is simply a contradiction in terms. Experienced facts belong to the past or present. And it is self-contradictory to say that any inference can be drawn from them in regard to the *future*, except by help of some premiss alleged to be intuitive: as, *e.g.*, “the future will resemble the past;” or (as Dr. Bain more accurately words it) “What has uniformly been in the past will be in the future.” “This assumption,” Dr. Bain proceeds (“Deductive Logic,” p. 274), “is an ample justification of the inductive operation: without it we can do nothing; with it we can do everything. Our only error is in proposing to give any reason or justification of it; to treat it otherwise than as *begged* at the very outset.” Is Saul, then, also among the prophets? Is Dr. Bain at last an Intuitionist? For as to this “assumption” of which he speaks—what is it at last but precisely what we have called an alleged “truth of intuition”? Manifestly, if inductive science cannot reasonably be constructed except on the basis of this “assumption,” it cannot reasonably be constructed at all on the exclusive basis of experienced facts.

Here, therefore, we will revert to what we just now said. The stern rejection (we said) of all first premisses except experienced facts, not only is not a characteristic of inductive science, but would be the destruction of that science. Take Dr. Bain’s thesis, that “the future will resemble the past.” It would, of course, be an unspeakable absurdity to say that this is an experienced fact. But neither can any experienced facts be alleged, which in any combination will suffice by themselves logically to *prove* this thesis, or even to make it ever so faintly probable. A science, then, which should be based exclusively on experienced facts, would not throw one glimmering of light on the future. It might show that, *at this moment*, such or such a medicine is a remedy for such or such a disease; such or such a chemical combination issues in such or such a result; such or such an arch bears such or such a weight, &c. &c. But it would throw absolutely no light whatever on the question, whether such statements will be even proximately correct, a day or an hour

beyond this moment. Dr. Bain points out very truly, that such a science would be absolutely valueless. What we are ourselves saying is, that at all events it would be fundamentally different from what is now called "inductive science." That which is now called "inductive science" would be utterly overthrown and subverted, if its votaries rejected all first premisses except experienced facts.

We have argued, that if no first premisses were admissible except experienced facts, two grave consequences would inevitably ensue. Firstly, man could have neither certain nor even probable information, concerning nature's uniformity in times long past; nor, secondly, could he form so much as any reasonable conjecture of the kind, concerning (even the most immediate) future. Here, however, a further question will most reasonably be asked. Let intuitive premisses be admitted no less than phenomenal—in other words, let true (and not false) philosophical principles be assumed—what will *then* be ascertained as sound doctrine, in regard to man's extent of knowledge concerning past and future phenomenal uniformity? We merely indicate this question, to show that we have not forgotten its reasonableness. Plainly it is quite irrelevant to our own argument; and we really do not happen to be acquainted with any writer, who (to our mind) fairly confronts it. Its consideration is one of the various philosophical lacunæ—much more numerous (we think) than might have been expected—which arrest the course of a straightforward student, and dissatisfy him with existent philosophical treatises.

So much, then, on that one foundation of inductive science—of the science which Phenomenists specially claim as their own—the doctrine of phenomenal uniformity. But all this is really as nothing, compared with the further objection to Phenomenism, which we have pressed on many former occasions, and to which we have never received a reply even superficially plausible. Every man, throughout every minute of his waking life, is eliciting one or other of those intuitive acts, which are called acts of *memory*. If he accept these acts as testifying objective truth, he is *ipso facto* an Intuitionist and no Phenomenist. If he do not so accept them, his knowledge is below that of the very brutes; being strictly confined to his consciousness of the present moment.* Let us explain our meaning in this statement.

The Phenomenist purports to build his whole philosophical

* We have here often made an explanation, which it may be better to make again. Those avouchments of memory, to which we refer in the text, are those only which concern a man's *quite recent* experience—the memory of a minute or a few minutes back. A man's memory of what took place a long time ago, is often far from infallible.

structure on "experienced facts"; and he must mean of course facts which he *knows* to have been experienced. We ask him how he can possibly know that there is any given fact in the whole world, which has been experienced by any one whomsoever. Most certainly he does not know more as to what *others* have experienced, than of what he has experienced *himself*. We ask him, then, straightforwardly, how can you possibly know, concerning any given mental phenomenon in the whole world, that you have once experienced it? You reply, that you have the clearest and most articulate memory thereof. Well, we do not doubt at all that you have that present *impression*, which you call a most clear and articulate memory. But how do you know—how can you legitimately even guess—that your present impression corresponds with a past fact? See what a tremendous proposition this is, which you, who call yourself a cautious man of science, unscrupulously take for granted. You have been so wonderfully endowed—such is your prodigious assertion—that in every successive case your clear and articulate present *impression* and *belief* of something as past corresponds with a past mental *fact*. That this should happen even once is surely (on Phenomenistic principles) a very remarkable coincidence; but you assume as a matter of course—without so much as any attempt at proof—that this marvellous fact occurs some thousand times in every hour of your waking life. What is the true *rationale* of your proceeding? There is but one answer which can possibly be given. You are acting like a reasonable man, *i.e.*, like an Intuitionist. You accept your intuitive act of memory as an infallible voucher for your firm conviction, that certain experiences have befallen you in time past, which are entirely external to your present consciousness.

In truth, the distinction is fundamental between my *present* and my *past* experience. "I am conscious of a most clear and articulate *impression*, that a very short time ago I was suffering cold";—this is one judgment. "A very short time ago, I was suffering cold": this is another judgment, absolutely and unmistakably distinct from the former. That I know my present impression, by no manner of means implies that I know my past feeling. Here, for instance, are two judgments:—"It is wrong to eat beef:" "*The Hindoo thinks* that it is wrong to eat beef." These two judgments (it will be admitted) fundamentally and clamorously differ from each other. But they do not differ from each other *more* fundamentally and clamorously than the judgment, "I was then feeling cold," differs from the judgment, "I have the present *impression* that I was then feeling cold." The latter, no doubt, is the dictate of my present experience; but the former cannot be anything else than a truth of intuition.

The consistent Phenomenist, then—the consistent repudiator of intuitions—cannot (as we have often pointed out) possess any knowledge whatever, great or small, except only of his present momentary consciousness.

Had space permitted, we might with advantage have recapitulated a much larger portion of our earlier controversies against Phenomenism; but we must proceed without further delay to point our moral. Mr. Stuart Mill complains that the opposite school alleges certain tenets as self-evident; “erects them into their own absolutely sufficient vouchers and justifications; and uses them for the purpose of consecrating all deep-seated prejudices.” Now, a truth, which is “its own absolutely sufficient voucher and justification,” is precisely what we call a truth of intuition; and we have admitted throughout that, without the assumption of intuitive premisses, Theism cannot be argumentatively established. But (as we have now been arguing) Theism is not the *only* important doctrine so circumstanced. On the contrary, there is absolutely no doctrine, existent or conceivable, which *can* be established without the help of intuitive premisses; nay, if men do not avail themselves of such premisses, their knowledge will be below that of the very brutes. Whatever else therefore may or may not be true, the Phenomenist’s position, at all events, is a suicidal absurdity.

Of course an Antitheist—having become an Intuitionist—may most reasonably raise a further question. He may maintain that, whereas the intuitions alleged by him are genuine, those alleged by his opponents are spurious. In our future articles we shall have to join issue on this indictment, as regards each successive tenet which we shall allege as intuitive. We may as well, however, point out at once, that our opponent will here have an uncommonly difficult part to play. “It is an undoubtedly valid intuition,” he will have to say, “which declares that the uniformity of nature dates back (say) six thousand years. It is an undoubtedly valid intuition, which declares that the said uniformity will continue in the future for quite an indefinite period. It is an undoubtedly valid intuition, which declares in each successive case that my feelings of five minutes ago were what my memory now declares them to have been. But it is no valid intuition, which declares that $2 + 5$ necessarily equals $3 + 4$; or that to slander my neighbour is necessarily wrong.” Here is surely a startling and paradoxical position, if ever such there were. Still, all this is external to our immediate theme. What we are now urging is this. The proposition maintained by Mr. Mill and his school, that there are *no* genuine intuitions—no truths external to present experience, “which are their own sufficient vouchers and justifications”—this proposition, at all events, is out of court.

It is a proposition clamorously repudiated by the common sense and clear insight of mankind : it expresses a theory, which may now fairly be relegated to the limbo of exploded philosophical absurdities.

It will be asked,—If the characteristic tenet of Phenomenism is so entirely destitute of philosophical foundation, how can it have happened that so many men of such undoubted, and in many cases most conspicuous, ability have prevailed on themselves to accept it? Still more, how is it that they have conceived so great an antipathy to Theism? This question leads us to what we proposed at starting as the second theme to be discussed in our present article. There are, no doubt, very many successful labourers in the field of physical science, who exhibit a violent antipathy to the kind of reasoning adopted for the establishment of Theistic doctrine, and a still more intense antipathy to that doctrine itself. It is our business, then, here to account for this antipathy. We will begin with the former; the antipathy exhibited by Phenomenists to Theistic *reasoning*. And we will preface our remarks by drawing attention to the truly marvellous results which physical science has achieved in these late centuries. Lord Macaulay has vigorously depicted this fact, in a well-known passage, which we may as well quote :—

The new Philosophy has lengthened life ; it has mitigated pain ; it has extinguished diseases ; it has increased the fertility of the soil ; it has given new securities to the mariner ; it has furnished new arms to the warrior ; it has spanned great rivers and estuaries with bridges of form unknown to our fathers ; it has guided the thunderbolt innocuously from heaven to earth ; it has lighted up the night with the splendour of the day ; it has extended the range of the human vision ; it has multiplied the power of the human muscles ; it has accelerated motion ; it has annihilated distance ; it has facilitated intercourse, correspondence, all friendly offices, all despatch of business ; it has enabled men to descend to the depths of the sea, to soar into the air, to penetrate securely into the noxious recesses of the earth, to traverse the land in cars which whirl along without horses, and the ocean in ships which run ten knots an hour against the wind. These are but a part of its fruits, and of its first fruits. For it is a philosophy which never rests, which has never attained, which is never perfect. Its law is progress. A point which yesterday was invisible is its goal to-day, and will be its starting-point to-morrow.—*Essay on Lord Bacon.*

We cannot be surprised that any one who fixes his keen interest and attention on studies which have issued in results like these,—still less one who is himself occupied in relevant physical investigations,—should become, as it were, intoxicated under such an influence. We cannot be surprised at his

assuming, as a matter of course, that it is experimental methods, and no others, which can afford solid foundation of argument for important truth. No doubt (as we have been pointing out above) the whole cogency of a physicist's argument in each successive case rests in last analysis on intuitive premisses; and without the assumption of such premisses, his experiments would be entirely valueless. Still, what his mind incessantly dwells on are not such premisses as these: on the contrary, he entirely forgets them, or would even, on occasion, deny their existence. When, therefore, he hears of propositions the most extensive being predominantly proved by intuitive assumptions—unless he is an unusually large-minded and dispassionate man—he is tempted to regard such a method of reasoning with angry contempt. His life is mainly occupied with such arguments as those, *e.g.*, which establish that diamonds are combustible, or that oil and alkali taken in combination produce a soap. Let us suppose, then, that such an argument is placed before him as that on which we insisted in January, 1880, and which occupies so prominent a place in Theistic advocacy. "Whatever is known to me," we said, "as intrinsically and necessarily wrong, is also known to me intuitively as necessarily forbidden by some Superior Being, who possesses over me rightful jurisdiction." This proposition, if true, is manifestly one of insurpassable importance; and our scientist asks us for its ground. We have, of course, nothing to reply, except that mental phenomena, if studied carefully and with prolonged attention, show the genuineness of this alleged intuition. Such a method of argument is one, with which his own studies bring him into no sort of contact; and, again, it is one, the validity of which is incapable of being tested in this world by any subsequent verification,—such verification, *e.g.*, as attends his researches concerning the combustibleness of a diamond or the composition of oil and alkali. For his own part, then, he could as readily believe, with the astrologers, that by studying the course of the stars one may obtain knowledge of future human events,—as he could believe that by merely studying the human mind one can acquire knowledge of a Superhuman Being. His reasoning is, of course, poor and shallow enough; but it is surely very natural in any scientist who has not been carefully trained in different principles, unless (as we have said) he is unusually large-minded and dispassionate. Consequently (which is our immediate point) the fact that certain most brilliant and successful explorers of external nature deride the intuitional method as unsubstantial and even childish,—constitutes no kind of presumption, that this method may not, nevertheless, be (as we have shown that it is) the only possible foundation of human knowledge.

Lord Macaulay—in the article from which we have just quoted—unintentionally, but effectively, confirms our reasoning. His own sympathies with physical science have quite incapacitated him for appreciating any less superficially tangible course of speculation. In most manifest sympathy with Bacon, he points out that the English philosopher “did not consider Socrates’s philosophy a happy event.” He adds on his own account, that Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and the rest cultivated an “unfruitful wisdom;” “systematically misdirected their powers;” “added nothing to the stock of knowledge;” gathered in no other “garners” than of “smut and stubble.” As to the great Christian thinkers—St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and the rest—he does not even condescend in this connection to hint at their existence. We suppose Lord Macaulay’s warmest admirers cannot read, without a blush of shame, various parts of the paper which we are criticising. Still, our point remains untouched. If so accomplished a writer, and one so versed in human affairs, could—even in some chance moment of excitement or aberration—have expressed such sentiments as these, how much more easily credible it is that the exclusive votaries of physical science may be guilty of the like perverse and shallow injustice, towards a line of thought essentially differing from their own.

Here an ingenious objection may perhaps be started, which shall take the shape of an argument *ad hominem*. We cannot ourselves deny—so some opponent of ours may suggest—that God desires the cultivation of physical science. How, then, can we maintain (he may proceed to ask) that such cultivation tends to the overthrow of religious belief, and to the establishment of secularism on its ruins? In reply, we heartily concede that God desires the cultivation of physical science; but we do not for a moment admit, that the sedulous cultivation of such science has of itself an irreligious tendency. The evil effect which we deplore arises from the fact, that physical science is cultivated by a large number of persons, who have not been previously trained in the general elements of religious philosophy. Cardinal Newman’s noble work on “The Idea of a University” is fruitful in dissertation on this theme. He descants on the grievous calamity which befalls mankind, so far as at any given time or place the various branches of knowledge are exclusively pursued, each on its own special ground; and are thus deprived of the safeguard afforded to each one, by combination with other portions of the scientific cyclopædia. In a wisely conducted Christian university, the danger on which we are commenting would be entirely removed; while there would be at the same time abundant scope for the most diligent investigations in the sphere of physical science. Indeed, true as it is that the pursuit of physical science

urgently needs the corrective afforded by science metaphysical and religious;—it is no less true (we strongly think) that metaphysical and religious science derive great advantage from the contemporaneous presence of physical. But this is a theme on which we have no space here to enlarge.

So much on the antipathy exhibited by Phenomenists towards the reasoning which a Theist draws out for his doctrine. Still more intense (as we have said) is their antipathy to that doctrine itself. This antipathy is founded on their own amazing notions, concerning human life and human conduct; and we will therefore introduce our treatment of it by a short comment on those notions. I know intimately two persons, A and B. I have found A a man of spotless integrity; remarkable for steady self-command; strictly just to all with whom he has dealings; carefully considerate to his dependants; discriminatingly and most abundantly generous to the necessitous; full of public spirit; exemplary in all his domestic relations.* I have found B, on the contrary, cowardly and self-indulgent; selfish in his family and indifferent to the public good; steering very near the wind on matters of common honesty and straightforwardness; evincing no sense of his own defects, nor making any effort to correct them. If I am a Phenomenist, I am compelled by my principles to recognize no other distinction between A and B, than one entirely similar to the distinction which exists between an efficient and a rickety locomotive. The course of conduct pursued by A cannot, in any intelligible sense, be called by me "higher," "nobler," "more excellent," than that pursued by B. All which I can say is, that A's life is more *beneficial to mankind* than B's; just as an efficient locomotive is more beneficial to mankind than a rickety one. Then, secondly, even if A's conduct could be called higher and nobler than B's, still I could not award him any *praise* for it; because I hold that he has no Free Will, and that he is as simply, therefore, at the mercy of surrounding circumstances, as is the locomotive with which we are comparing him. Now it will throw light on the utter unnaturalness of Phenomenism if we proceed to point out, that no Phenomenist on earth can possibly confront A and B as concrete persons—can come across them in the actual affairs of life—and so think of them as his principles require. He has, literally, no more physical power of withholding his respect from A, or his disrespect from B, than he has of jumping over a fence twenty feet high. Does he feel *respect*, then, for a serviceable locomotive? Or does he feel *dis-*

* We do not speak in the text of A's love and obedience towards Almighty God—which, of course, we account the highest crown of a virtuous life—because we are arguing with Antitheists.

respect for one which, by permitting itself to be blown up, inflicts fearful injury on human life?

One might have fancied, on first thoughts, that such a crucial fact as this would disabuse him of his unnatural and revolting tenet. But every one knows how marvellous is the power possessed by a theorist, of withholding attention from individual cases which militate against his theory. Let us fix our attention, then, on the theory of Phenomenists, and we shall cease to wonder at their detestation of Theism. They consider (1) that man knows not the existence of any life beyond the grave; (2) that no such quality exists, as that which Intuitionists call "virtuousness," and which we have treated in two preceding articles; (3) that every man is as simply at the mercy of his circumstances, internal and external, as is a football of given composition when kicked about by players in a field. As regards, therefore, the standard of moral value in any given act, no other standard is to them even possible, except only the tendency of that act to promote earthly enjoyment. As regards the reasonable motive of human actions, no other motive (on their view) is consistent with common sense, except that each man try to grasp for himself all the earthly enjoyment he can. As regards education, they must account any attempt to train some given youth by means of *praise* or *blame* a dishonest "pious fraud;" nor have they any other resource, except to do their utmost that he be taught to find his own pleasure in what most promotes the earthly enjoyment of his fellow-men. The furtherance of earthly enjoyment in each and in all—this is that ethical end, which alone is consistent with their theory; and their whole mind is saturated with the thought of it. Moreover, men's earthly enjoyment is the one purpose to which their favourite processes of inductive science are directed.

In this state of mind they turn their thoughts to Theism. Now—as M. Ollé-Laprune points out in the treatise to which we shall presently draw attention—genuine Theism is vitally connected with certain other doctrines also. Full Theistic belief includes, not only belief in God's Existence, but also in Free Will; in the necessary character of Ethical Truth; and in the Soul's Immortality. The genuine Theist, then, regards this world mainly and predominantly as a place of probation. With him, the real and true interests of life are almost entirely concentrated on that which follows after death; the present brief period of existence having in his eyes little other value, except as regards its bearing on the life to come. On the other hand, he accounts that bearing so close, that no words can exaggerate the intimacy of its connection; and Free Will (as he views the matter) is granted by God to men, in order that (by patient continuance of well-

doing) they may avoid future woe and reap future reward. Now we do not, of course, mean that the great mass of Theists act with steady consistency on this doctrine: of enormous numbers, one does not see how it can be said that they act on it at all. Still, the four Theistic doctrines which we mentioned above, when taken together, *mean* what we have just said, or they mean nothing whatever. It is not merely the Catholic who regards them as having this full significance; though, of course, we are most ready to admit—or rather most earnest to maintain—that nowhere else is genuine Theism so purely exhibited as within the Catholic Church. But, as one instance out of a thousand, take *e.g.*, the Rev. Dr. Martineau; a preacher, who is alas! very widely indeed removed from Catholic Dogma. His truly admirable volumes called “Hours of Thought” inculcate a standard of human action, not one whit below what we have just set forth.

Now, the more extreme and fanatical of the Phenomenistic Antitheists protest with excitement, and with a kind of fury, in the name of “suffering humanity,” against such a view as this. “This life,” they say, “is the only term of existence which we have any reason whatever to expect. And is this brief period of man’s enjoyment to be poisoned and changed into a time of self-torture by the fantastical dream of an imaginary hereafter? * Humanity forbid! Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die. Those who promote such theories, concerning the obligation of present obedience to a Deity and the ever-impending peril of future woe, are simply odious conspirators against the happiness of mankind.”

In truth there are a certain number of violent thinkers, who cleave to the “great cause” of man’s earthly enjoyment with a fanaticism as heated and blind, as any class of religionists ever exhibited towards the specialties of their sect. Of such men it is hardly to be expected, without a kind of miracle, that the most cogent adverse reasoning imaginable shall produce on them its due effect. Still, it is by no means all Antitheists who

* We must not be understood to admit for a moment, what Antitheists here imply; to admit for a moment, that religiousness is ordinarily adverse to earthly happiness. No doubt there is many an irreligious man far happier than many a pious man: so great is the power of temperament, and, again, of external circumstances. But we are confident that, in all ordinary cases, the same man, under the same external environment, is happier in proportion as he is more pious. At the same time we admit that there are certain saintly souls, whom God visits on earth with exceptional tribulation, in order that their probation may be nobler and their future crown brighter.

On the other hand, let it be remembered how keen an anguish is inflicted on many minds, by the notion that man has no knowledge of a life beyond the grave.

are so inaccessible to argument: on the contrary, many are fully convinced, indeed, of their own tenets, but without being so simply intolerant and contemptuous towards opponents. Then, there are, perhaps, not a few who—while they are strongly impressed with the force of Antitheistic reasoning and find great difficulty in reconciling religion with their scientific convictions—shrink nevertheless from definitively taking their place in the irreligious camp; owing to their dread of the tremendous moral and social evils which would result from rejection of God.* Lastly, there are many, who have ever been Theists and earnestly desire so to remain, who, nevertheless (for the sake of their own future security) wish to understand how the prevalent Anti-theistic arguments can be met. Here, then, is a rough classification of those thinkers, to whom our course of reasoning in future articles will be directly addressed.

Of course at this time of day we do not profess to have unearthed any novel arguments in defence of Theism: such a profession would be absurd enough. But there is a philosophical work of extreme importance, which urgently needs being done. It is urgently needful, that the recognized Theistic arguments be exhibited in such a shape, that their indubitable cogency shall be capable of being made immediately manifest to the particular thinkers whom we have in view. And, again, it is hardly less necessary, that a philosophical method be brought before their attention, which, on one hand, shall commend itself to them as plainly reasonable; while, on the other hand, it may afford them the greatest attainable protection against their own reckless impetuosity. Such, and no less, is the task which we are venturing to undertake. We cannot hope, indeed, that we shall even approximately “rise to the height of our great argument”: on the contrary, no one feels more keenly than ourselves the incompleteness and manifold imperfection of what we do. But we hope, nevertheless, that we shall be able to submit suggestions of real importance, which more competent artificers may substantially accept and more successfully develop.

And there is another cognate task, which naturally falls within the same scope. It would be a most serious mistake to suppose, that the atheistic current of the day flows only among men of cultivated and scientific minds: though, even were this so, the

* So a writer—manifestly himself an unbeliever—in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of Sept. 21, 1881. He says, “Faith in the supernatural has a wonderful power of adapting itself to scientifically established facts. Already the hesitations and admissions of those who have pushed scientific conclusions to the fullest, and the speculations of other men of science about the ‘Unseen Universe,’ might convince the most timid that the world has not seen the last of religion.”

calamity would hardly be less in regard to the future prospects of mankind. But, in truth, the uneducated class is already, to no very small extent, more or less imbued with the poison. On this head we will give a short extract or two from a very powerful article, which appeared in the *Month* as far back as September, 1874:—

The spread of infidelity [says the writer] among a large part of the generation now entering, or having entered, upon the full enjoyment and use of life, has reached the line at which even morality becomes a sentiment rather than a law; conscience a phenomenon, rather than the voice of God sitting in judgment; Free Will and responsibility an imagination; the universe a physical system, self-evoked and self regulated; the soul of man a mechanism; the future of man a blank; sin, original and actual, a fiction; the Atonement an impossible superstition. . . .

The advance of infidelity among the lower classes in our towns; the extreme activity with which the poison is spread in books, cheap newspapers, by lectures and the like; and the measures by which this activity should be met on the side of all who are for religion and for God; should be subjects of earnest thought and meditation.

The writer proceeds with more to the same effect, on the growing prevalence of irreligious tenets among the uneducated class. Now, of course, our argument will not bring us into contact with considerations of a practical and quasi-political kind, however deeply important; such, *e.g.*, as the organization of good educational schemes. But we do hope to speak in due course on relevant questions, within what may be called the internal and personal sphere; so far, at least, as they concern the verities of Natural Religion. I come across some uncultured person, whom I find profoundly imbued with the fashionable infidelity. What course of thought and action can I recommend to him, which, on one hand, he will see to be reasonable, and in some sense obligatory; while, on the other hand, it will supply him with valid grounds for accepting Religious Truth? This question has a close relation with the general line of argument which we propose to ourselves; and we must not fail to bear it carefully in mind.

We implied last July, that we do not happen to know any other living writer who can so serviceably assist us in our anxious enterprise as M. Ollé-Laprune.* He is a thinker, deeply penetrated with Catholic Truth; he has made philosophy, both ancient and modern, his special study; he has carefully, discriminatingly,

* "De la Certitude Morale," par Léon Ollé-Laprune. Paris: Eugène Belin. 1880.

and appreciatively examined the various phases of Antitheism; he never once transgresses the laws of courtesy and self-restraint; and, above all, he writes consistently in that tone of earnest piety, which alone befits his most sacred theme. We do not, however, profess here either to follow his order of arrangement, or to analyse the general course of his work. Our space will not permit this. We must pursue our own independent line of thought; and content ourselves with such extracts from M. Lapruné, as shall serve to illustrate it. We should add, however, that our own line of thought has been, in many respects, much influenced by his.

We begin with expressly commemorating one important work which he has done, to which, indeed, we have already referred. We mentioned four cognate doctrines, as jointly constituting the Creed of a genuine Theist. They are (1) the necessary character of Ethical Truth; (2) Free Will; (3) the Existence of God; (4) a Future Life of Reward or Punishment. M. Lapruné (as far as we know) has been the first philosopher distinctly to insist on the fact, that these four doctrines have the closest philosophical union; that in practice (under the circumstances of the present day) they stand or fall together; that the proof of each one adds indefinite force to the proof of all the rest. On the other hand, he still more emphatically urges (we are convinced, with great truth) that these four doctrines stand out in characteristic separation—as regards their rational treatment—from any other subject of investigation whatever.* He calls the complex of these four doctrines by the name, "Moral Doctrine;" but, for reasons which will appear in due course, we prefer the name "Religious Doctrine." The term "Religious Doctrine," then—for the purpose of our present argument—we use as precisely signifying the complex of the four doctrines above mentioned; for we are prescinding entirely from Revelation and from the supernatural order. By the term "Theism" we designate that particular and central doctrine of the four—God's Existence. But we shall not preclude ourselves from continuing to use the term "genuine Theism," as expressing the *whole body* of "Religious Doctrine."

Before we enter on any argument, it will greatly conduce to clearness if we explain in one or two details the conclusions which we are in due course to advocate. And, firstly, we shall maintain (with M. Lapruné and the general body of Christian philosophers) that the whole assemblage of "Religious Doctrine" admits of absolutely conclusive scientific establishment. We mean this—An explicit train of argument admits of being exhibited, resting

* The exact meaning of this statement will presently appear. It does not ever so distantly imply, that these doctrines are proved with less absolute certainty than others.

on given truths of intuition and on given experienced facts as on its primary premisses. And in regard specially to these "truths of intuition," a course of psychological investigation is producible, which proves with certainty that they are really what they claim to be. Such train of argument, we add, is sufficient entirely to convince any reasonable and intellectually competent person—however adverse his original prepossessions—who shall choose to fix his mind on it; to study it with patient candour and with a sustained struggle of attention. Indeed, if this were not so, the profession of philosophical argument would be unmeaning. How far, indeed, it is probable that existent Antitheists will in fact *exercise* this patient candour and sustained struggle of attention—here is a different inquiry altogether; but one on which we shall in due course have something to add.

We shall not be misunderstood, then, as in any way disparaging the absolute conclusiveness of the philosophical argument, when we proceed to say that, according to God's merciful design, argument was not to have constituted any part of the original ground on which religious belief reposes.* Our readers must remember, that we are not at this moment professing to *reason*, but merely to exhibit certain conclusions for which in due course we shall *give* our reasons. And what we hold on the present subject is this:—Whenever men are obliged to *depend* on argument for their religious belief, this can only be because (whether or no through their own fault) they have failed to embrace and appropriate those more solid and penetrating proofs of Religious Doctrine, which God has offered in an implicit shape to mankind in general. This truth is so vitally important in its whole bearing on the Theistic controversy, that we must not fail to place before our readers again a most pregnant and beautiful passage of F. Kleutgen's, which we have more than once exhibited in previous numbers. The passage is very long, but we are confident that no reader will find it tedious. We will but premise two brief remarks. Firstly F. Kleutgen is directly speaking of Theism proper; but his view of things will evidently apply no less to the whole of what we have called "Religious Doctrine." Secondly, the author implies throughout that there can be no invincible ignorance of God. On this matter, however, we wish carefully to abstain from all expression of opinion, until we reach that part of our course in which it will be expressly and fully treated.

These, then, are F. Kleutgen's words:—

* Reasoning may be "explicit" or "implicit." It is explicit reasoning which we call "argument." This is (we think) the common usage: certainly it is Cardinal Newman's.

In many places Scripture declares, in the most express manner, that even for those to whom God has not manifested Himself by His Prophets, or by His Son, there exists a revelation of God in His works, and even within the mind of men, whereby they can without any difficulty cognize God, their Creator and Maker, as well as His sovereign law. It is not necessary to point out that Scripture does not in this speak of any [supposable] first cause; but of the Living and True God, Who has created heaven and earth, and inscribed His law in the heart of man: and that, consequently, it speaks also of the moral order. Now, it says in the same passages that men who do not thus cognize their God are without excuse; that they are insensate; that they deserve God's wrath and all His chastisements. It necessarily follows, then, that this manifestation of God by His works is such, that man cannot fail by this means to cognize God with certitude, unless he commit a grave fault.

Assuredly this does not mean that it is philosophical researches, continued laboriously through obstacles and doubts, which can alone lead to knowledge of God. Very few men, in fact, are capable of these laborious researches: whereas Scripture speaks of all the heathens in general; and in the Book of Wisdom it is said expressly (xiii. 1), "All men are vanity who do not possess the knowledge of God." The sacred writer even adds that this knowledge, to which he gives the name of "sight" to express its clearness and certitude ["cognoscibiliter poterit Creator horum videri"—v. 5], can be obtained with as much ease (and even more) as knowledge of this world: which certainly does not fail any one capable of the least reflection. ["Si tantum potuerunt scire ut possent æstimare sæculum, quomodo hujus Dominum non facilius invenerunt"—v. 9]. . . . It is easier, therefore, to know God, the Governor of the world, than to know enough of nature to admire its power and its beauty.

It necessarily follows, therefore, that there is a knowledge of God different from philosophical knowledge; a knowledge so easy to acquire and so certain, that ignorance and doubt on that head cannot be explained, except either by culpable carelessness or proud obstinacy. Such is also . . . the common doctrine of the Holy Fathers: they distinguish that knowledge of God which is obtained by philosophical research, from that which springs up spontaneously in every man at the very sight of creation. This latter kind of knowledge is called by them "a witness of Himself," which God gave to the soul at its creation; "an endowment of nature;" "an infused knowledge," inherent in every man without preliminary instruction; a knowledge which springs up in some sense of itself, in proportion as reason is developed; and which cannot fail, except in a man either deprived of the use of reason or else given up to vices which have corrupted his nature. And when the Fathers of the Church declare unanimously on this head that this knowledge is really found and established in all men, the importance of their testimony is better understood, by remembering that they lived in the midst of heathen populations.

God has implanted in our reasonable nature everything which is

necessary, that we may know Him, and know Him with facility. Now, He does not (after creation) withdraw Himself from creatures, but always remains near them; co-operating with them, exciting them to act, supporting and directing each one to its end conformably to its nature. If this is true of all creatures, how could this concurrence be refused to the most noble of all creatures, to those whom God has created for the very purpose of their knowing and loving Him? Man, indeed, does not arrive at his end, except by using the powers which God has given him; but the Author of those gifts lends to man His concurrence, in order that he may make due use of them. Since that moral and religious life for which man was created is founded on a knowledge of the truths whereof we speak, God watches over man, in order that reason, as it is developed, may come to know them with facility and certainty. Observe, the question here is not of supernatural grace, but is [of the natural order]. . . .

What would not be the misery of man [if there were no reasonable certainty without philosophical argument]? It is easy to show those [ordinary] men who are capable of any reflection at all, that their knowledge of the truth is not scientific; that they do not deduce it [reflexively and explicitly] from the first principles of thought; and, consequently, they cannot defend it against the attacks of scepticism. If, then, as soon as we come to know that our knowledge is not scientific, the conviction of its truth were at once shaken,—what, on that supposition, would be the lot of man? . . .

The fact is, indeed, not so: that consciousness which every one can interrogate within himself attests its denial; and at every period the voice of mankind has confirmed that denial. As soon as we arrive at the use of reason, the voice of conscience wakes within us; whether we choose or no, we must cognize the distinction between good and evil. [Again] just as it is absolutely impossible for us to doubt our own existence [in like manner], we are absolutely compelled to regard as real the external world; [to hold] that, further, there exists a Supreme Author of our being and of all other things; and that through Him there is a certain moral order. These also are truths which we cannot refuse to admit. No doubt we can do violence to ourselves in order to produce in ourselves the contrary persuasion, just as we may use efforts to regard the moral conscience itself as an illusion. But these efforts never succeed, or, at least, never succeed perfectly; and we feel ourselves even under an obligation of condemning the very attempt as immoral. The mind of man, in fact, is under the influence of truth: which has dominion over it, and which gives [man] certainty, even against his own wish. Truth manifests itself to our intelligence, and engenders therein the knowledge of its reality, even before we [explicitly] know what that truth is. Still, truth [I say] reigns over man and reveals itself to him (however great may be his resistance) as a sacred and sovereign authority, which commands him and summons him before its tribunal: and [standing] before that tribunal he is obliged to admit the immorality of even attempting to doubt. Just as he is bound to condemn the madness, I will not say of doubting, but of trying to doubt, the

reality of the external world,—so he is obliged to regard as an impiety [all] doubt of God's Existence and Providence. . . .

Nor can it be here objected that conscience (in the proper sense of that word, moral conscience) gives no certainty so long as its existence within us and its pronouncements are purely spontaneous. Of the conscience, more than of anything else, it may be said that it reveals to us its own truth; that it compels us to acknowledge an absolute good and a sovereign rule over our wills and actions (even though we know not its innermost nature), not only as really existing, but as an august and sacred power which is [in authority] over us. Whatever efforts man may make to overthrow and destroy his own intimate persuasion on the truthfulness of conscience, he will never succeed in doing so. Even though he seek by every possible means to persuade himself that nothing obliges him to regard it as truthful, nevertheless he will always feel himself compelled to acknowledge its authority and even to condemn his own resistance to it.

It is true, indeed, that, though conscience often speaks against a man's inclinations [so loudly] as to confound (by its manifestation of its own truthfulness) all pride and all the sophistical dreams by which he might wish to stifle it; still it does not *always* so speak and raise its voice, as to take from man the power of turning from it and refusing to listen. If he enters into himself and chooses to observe what passes within him, he will obtain that reflexive knowledge which, as we have said above, is required for actual certainty; he will know that he cannot prevent himself from acknowledging the truth of what the voice of conscience dictates. But it is in his power, if not always at least often, to abstain from entering into himself and lending his ear to that voice. He has [often] the power of not hearing it, or of giving it so little attention that he withdraws himself from that influence which would make him certain. It is in this manner that, for a certain time at least, notwithstanding the habitual certainty* which nature gives him, he may remain undecided on the truthfulness of conscience, supposing that he has not yet acknowledged that truthfulness by philosophical reflection, or again that he does not seek to know it. But, even though we were not able to demonstrate by the intimate experience of every man that the doubt whereof we speak is contrary to the principles of morality—we ought nevertheless to be persuaded of that truth by the judgment of all mankind. Among civilized nations, in every time, the necessity of philosophical studies has been admitted, and those have been held in high esteem who devoted themselves thereto and who were regarded as sages. Nevertheless, though the nations (it is true) accepted at the hands of philosophers the solution of many questions, they have never ascribed to these men a decisive judgment on all truth without exception. As to those first truths on which all our convictions rest, humanity bears within itself the consciousness, or intimate persuasion, of knowing them with certainty. Philosophers may make these

* By "habitual certainty," as he has explained just before, F. Kleutgen means to express the *proximate power* of actual certainty.

truths the subject of their speculations : but they are not allowed the right of pronouncing a definitive judgment on these truths; and if their researches lead them to deny or doubt them, those very persons, who would otherwise be the disciples of these philosophers, rise up against them as judges and condemn them. Was there ever a nation which did not regard it as madness to doubt an external world? A nation which did not hold in horror a man so perverted, as to acknowledge no truth superior to the senses, and reject all distinction between virtue and vice? Has not Atheism among all nations been accounted a crime? And, by the very fact of seeing culpability in the denial of these truths, does not the world declare that they cannot possibly be unknown to men of good will?—*Philosophie Scolastique*, nn. 226–32.

F. Kleutgen, then, holds (1) that uncultured persons have full means of knowing with absolute certainty God's Existence; and (2) that God, by His Providence, watches over individuals one by one, impressing on their mind in due opportunity those implicit apprehensions and inferences, which reasonably generate such certain knowledge. The same is Cardinal Franzelin's teaching ("De Deo," pp. 93–97). And it is this, add the same two great writers, which the Fathers mean, when they unanimously assert that the knowledge of God is "divinely infused" into the human intellect.* And, for our part, we follow the late F. Dalgairns, in holding (see one of his *Contemporary Review* articles) that those proofs of God's Existence, which are pressed by Him on man's attention in an implicit shape, are more subtle and profound, more penetrating, satisfying, and invigorating, even than those which philosophical investigation brings to light.

In what follows, our remarks are still primarily, but by no means exclusively, directed to Theism proper. Thinkers of every class will (we suppose) be ready to admit that, in all cases which need to be considered, belief in God's Existence is accompanied by belief in the other three religious doctrines which we have named above. We proceed, then, to ask, of what kind are those proofs of Theism, which are so salutarily impressed by God in an implicit shape on the human intellect? For our own part, we earnestly follow Cardinal Newman and F. Kleutgen, in assigning by far the principal place to those founded on man's moral nature and moral action. M. Lapruné does the same. Nowhere have we happened to see so admirable an exposition as he has given, of that moral and educational training, which implants a far deeper

* Cardinal Franzelin says, that the knowledge of God is "common to all who have not quenched the light of reason" (p. 93); to all except those in whom "human nature is depraved" (p. 100). We do not, however, ourselves see how it necessarily follows—because some given person possesses the proximate power of cognizing God with certainty—that he sins gravely by not exercising that power.

and more permanent conviction of Religious Doctrine, than does any other possible method. We will give a quotation or two out of many which we should like to exhibit; only—in accordance with a previous remark—where M. Lapruné uses the word “moral,” we substitute “religious;” and the italics are ours, not his:—

The transmission of [religious] truths cannot be effected at one stroke, by pure reasoning, coldly. They are communicated to the child by education; and if a man, entirely persuaded of their truth, wishes to imbue others with them, he must, in his turn, have recourse to persuasion.

[In the matter of *instruction*] the child acquires the speculative knowledge which he needs, by a *series of lessons* fitted to his intelligence. Nothing of the kind takes place in *education*. This is a work of *every moment* it is the formation of the soul, a cultivation of the human being. Nothing can be more various than its methods, or more elastic than its character: it accommodates itself to each need, to each circumstance: it adjusts itself to the thousand exigencies of man's living nature, and puts to its own use the thousand resources of that nature. Its work is to excite, direct, develop the conscience and the reason; and *preserve the moral atmosphere which is adapted to foster them*. In this labour—so incessant, delicate, difficult—its great art is to *obtain active co-operation from its recipient*. Its purpose is—not to act for him—but to *teach him to act for himself*. So we support and direct the infant, when we are teaching him to walk. [Religious] education is an initiation; it advances by degrees, and addresses itself to the soul all round. It labours to make [religious] truths grow into the very substance of the human being; to become the soul of his soul, and the life of his life (pp. 378–380).

Presently (p. 385) he quotes similar language, from that illustrious philosopher, Maine de Biran.

It is necessary [for the securest and most certainly permanent conviction], that [religious] truths incorporate themselves in us and uninterruptedly penetrate us. There is a slow penetration of every day—an intro-susception of that truth which should be our guide throughout life—which effects, that such truths become to our soul what sunlight is to our eyes, which enlightens us without our seeking it.

As we have already explained, we are not indeed here professing to *argue*; but we *are* professing to exhibit, what we propose in due course to *maintain* by argument. We shall be asked, then, what we hold concerning the *reasonableness* of those religious convictions, which will be engendered by such a course of practical training as M. Lapruné supposes? As to their intensity and rootedness, there can be no second opinion: but how as to their *reasonableness*? On one hand, we do not at all profess that an Antitheist will find reasonable ground for aban-

doing his error, by merely contemplating that firmness of religious conviction which is generated in others by religious training. But, on the other hand, we shall maintain that, in the individual recipient of such training, the conviction thus acquired rests on entirely sufficient and conclusive grounds of reason. We should be inclined even to go farther; and to say that the Theism of those who lead consistently pious lives, rests on firmer grounds of reason than does the Theism of any others whomsoever. We should add, indeed, that religious education may most possibly be very far less thorough-going and pervasive than that described by M. Lapruné, and may yet be abundantly sufficient to generate reasonable certitude of Religious Truth.

It is this ethical argument, then, in favour of Theism, on which we lay our greatest stress. We hope in the next article of our series to exhibit it scientifically, and to meet successively the various objections against it which Antitheists will adduce. But there are other very powerful reasons also, which admit of being implicitly pressed by Almighty God on the human intellect as proof of His Existence. For instance, the principle of causation (see our number of July, 1876). This principle is deeply rooted in the mind of all adults: they have not so much as the power of gazing on this visible world, without cognizing that it must have some Self-Existent Being as its Author.* Further, the argument from design—the “teleological” argument, as it is now called—is one which appeals with extreme force to the uneducated; and we may add that recent scientific investigations have (we believe) strengthened rather than weakened its force. So, also, the analogous argument derived from the *order* of the Universe. Then, again, there are various truths, which are irresistibly borne in on the mind by contemplation of *beauty*. This may be called, perhaps, the “æsthetic” argument. Many minds, even otherwise uncultured, vaguely, but keenly, discern most precious realities through the veil of external beauty.

There are other arguments for Theism, which we have not included in this catalogue, as they are not within the reach of uncultured men. Such is the general consent of mankind. Such, again, is the argument, on which St. Augustine so repeatedly insists, and to which we are ourselves disposed to give a place only short of the highest. We refer to that founded on the demonstrated existence of Necessary Truth. If there be Necessary Truth, there must be a Necessary Being, on Whom such Truth is founded.

* No doubt—in this, as in so many other cases—uncandid persons, who cannot prevent themselves from “cognizing” this or that truth, may prevent themselves from “recognizing” it. On this we shall have much to say in future articles.

So much, then, on those proofs of God's Existence, concerning which it is most intelligible to affirm (with F. Kleutgen) that He conveys them to the apprehension of the most uncultured men, and thereby gives such men full power of knowing Him. The controversialist, however (we need hardly say), is concerned with these proofs, not in their implicit, but in their explicit shape; as capable of being brought directly before the attention of Anti-theistic philosophers. This will be our business in our future successive articles; but we had better at this point remind our readers what is our exact argumentative position. That which we have called "*Religious Truth*" consists of four doctrines:—(1) The necessary character of *Ethical Truth*; (2) *Man's Free Will*; (3) *God's Existence*; (4) the *Soul's Immortality*. The two first of these are required as premisses for the third; and they have received at our hands, we trust, sufficient treatment in the preceding portion of our course. The central one of all, we need hardly say, is *God's Existence*; on the argument for which we are to enter in our proximate articles. The argument for the *Soul's Immortality* requires for its efficacy the assumption of *God's Existence*; and, therefore, stands logically last in our list.

Meanwhile, what remains of our present article shall be occupied with one particular thesis, applicable to these religious doctrines as a whole. On this, again, M. Lapruné gives us very valuable assistance. But we will begin with a few comments of our own, calculated, we hope, to throw light on the position which he assumes.

And, first, as to the word "*certitude*," which is included in his title, and its correspondent term, "*certainty*." If I am "*certain*" of some truth, it possesses "*certainty*" in regard to *me*, and I possess "*certitude*" in regard to *it*. Now, let our Catholic readers carefully observe, that in what we shall here further say concerning "*certainty*" or "*certitude*," we shall entirely ignore "*supernatural*" certitude; we shall speak as though God had given men no revelation, nor raised them to the supernatural order. We entreat our Catholic readers to bear this in mind once for all; as otherwise they will grievously misapprehend what we are going to say. So much, then, being understood, we thus proceed. I possess "*certitude*" of some given truth always and only when I cognize grounds for its acceptance, which I recognize to be absolutely incompatible with its falsehood; and when consequently—in recognized conformity with reason—I yield to it absolute assent. What do we here mean by "*absolute*" assent? We mean that special firmness of assent, which is entirely incompatible with the co-existence of doubt.*

* *Certitude* (it will be seen) is as entirely within the reach of a rustic as of a philosopher. I, being a rustic, am absolutely certain that A B

We should say, nevertheless, that there are varying degrees of certitude; though this circumstance is not required by our argument, and we, therefore, omit its treatment. Then, there is another fact also which we do not forget, though we need not treat it on the present occasion. We refer to the fact, that there exists in many minds very frequently what may be called "spurious" certitude: or, in other words, that they very often yield "absolute" assent to some proposition, when they are cognizant of no grounds whatever which in reason can warrant such assent.

Many authors write as though the word "certitude" had different meanings, accordingly as one speaks of "metaphysical," "physical," or "moral" certitude respectively. To us, on the contrary, it seems (in accordance with the reasoning of F. Palmieri, S.J.) that the word "certitude" has precisely the same meaning in all three cases. Yet there is a very important sense in which we may prefix different adjectives to the word—viz., in order to express the *object-matter*, on which certitude has been attained. As a metaphysician, I am certain that every event necessarily has a cause. As a physicist, I am certain that all diamonds are naturally combustible. It is a very convenient, expression to say, that I am "metaphysically" certain of the former truth, and "physically" of the latter. Why is this a convenient expression? Because my reasonable method of arriving at certitude in things metaphysical, is so different from my reasonable method of arriving at certitude in things physical. I arrive at certitude in things physical, by pursuing such experiments as those indicated in works on Inductive Logic. But I arrive at certitude in things metaphysical, by carefully assuring myself that this or that mental phenomenon is my mind's authentic utterance of objective truth; by warily and cautiously carrying forward that truth to its legitimate consequences; and by other such appropriate methods. No two processes can be much more unlike, than the two we have named; but I am "certain" of a metaphysical truth, in the very same sense in which I am "certain" of a physical. In either case I cognize grounds for the acceptance of such truth, which I recognize as absolutely incompatible with the supposition of its falsehood.

We now take a further step. In the very same sense in which

has for some time past been my bitter enemy. I cognize a long series of facts, which (taken collectively) I recognize to be incompatible with the supposition of his not having been my bitter enemy. Make the grotesque hypothesis, that I suddenly become a philosopher. My grounds of certitude do not on that account become stronger: but I acquire a power which I did not possess before—of enumerating a sufficient number of those facts, and reflecting on the reasonableness of that certitude.

we speak of "metaphysical" and "physical" certitude respectively, we may properly enumerate *other* certitudes also: we may speak of "historical" certitude, *e.g.*, or "æsthetic" certitude. Those methods whereby I arrive at certitude in matters historical, are very largely different from those whereby I arrive at certitude in matters metaphysical or physical; and those methods whereby I arrive at certitude in matters of taste and beauty, are entirely different from any of the other three.* It is in this sense that M. Lapruné may most suitably speak of "religious" certitude: because he holds—and we heartily agree with him—that the methods whereby I arrive at certitude on religious doctrines, has special characteristics of its own; characteristics which it is important that the philosopher shall carefully study.

Here we can at last give our reason for preferring the terms "Religious Truth," "religious certitude," to M. Lapruné's terms, "Moral Truth," "moral certitude." The term "moral certitude" is so indissolubly associated, both in Catholic and non-Catholic theology and philosophy, with a totally different sense, that serious confusion (we think) would inevitably arise from M. Lapruné's terminology.

So much on this purely verbal question, and we proceed with the course of our argument. What, then, are the special characteristics of that process, whereby men reasonably arrive at certitude in the matter of Religious Truth? By far the most special characteristic of that process (we need hardly say) is one on which we have already insisted—viz., that by the constant practice of virtue and piety a deeper certitude is possessed of Religious Truth, than is obtainable by any philosophical investigation whatsoever. So far M. Lapruné and ourselves are entirely at one; and it is difficult to exaggerate the importance of what he and we thus hold in common.

But, further, M. Lapruné lays down as one chief characteristic of religious certitude, that it is acquired by eliciting acts of "natural faith." Here we venture to differ from him with some confidence, on the expediency of this expression; though we believe (as we shall presently point out) that we are in full accordance with the substance of what he intends to say. The recognized Catholic use of the word "faith" is most definite and intelligible. If I accept some proposition on human testimony, I thereby elicit an act of "human faith." If I accept some proposition on God's testimony, I thereby elicit an act of "divine faith." But if I accept some proposition on any other ground whatsoever, I do not thereby elicit any act of faith at all. We

* There is such a thing assuredly as æsthetic certitude. It is certain to me, *e.g.*, that Offenbach's music is less profound than Beethoven's, &c. &c.

think that Sir W. Hamilton and other non-Catholic Theists have introduced a very unfortunate confusion, by their vague use of this word "faith;" and we think that the interests of true philosophy will be far better promoted, by confining that word to its strict Catholic sense.*

One principal proposition which M. Lapruné intends to express, when he says that men acquire certitude of Religious Truth by means of natural faith, is especially worthy of attention. In fact it is the thesis to which we have above referred, as the proposed theme of our concluding remarks. Even where philosophically competent men are investigating Religious Truth by explicit argumentative methods,—its acceptance, nevertheless, on the part of those who have hitherto repudiated it, will be due far more to active and conscientious exercise of the *will*, than to subtlety, vigour, perspicacity of the intellect. For our own part, we heartily subscribe to this proposition. What we have just mentioned, is an especially distinctive characteristic of *religious* certitude, as compared with all other certitudes of the natural order.

And, first, we submit with much confidence, that—not on religious matters alone, but on all objects of human thought—the will's office, in the generation of legitimate certitude, is far more prominent than is often thought. Such a view as the following, *e.g.*, is maintained by several philosophers. "I am free," they say, "to use, or not to use, due diligence in collecting premisses, and in exhibiting to myself their due force; but there my power ceases." These philosophers speak no doubt exclusively of the natural order, and are not contemplating the case of divine faith. But, as regards the natural order, they consider me to be actually *necessitated* in the matter of ultimate assent. "If the premisses placed before my attention at this moment," they say, "are sufficient in reason to generate certitude, I am necessitated to be certain; if they are not sufficient, I have no power of eliciting genuine certitude at all: in neither case is there room for Free Will." Now of course we entirely concede, that there can be no genuine certitude of the natural order, where the premisses are not sufficient to *warrant* certitude, in the light of strict reason. But we are very far indeed from admitting, that men are necessitated to accept as certain every proposition, which reasonably *claims* such acceptance. On the contrary, we follow Cardinal Franzelin: who thus speaks in his work on "Truth in its relation to Reason" (ii. arts. 1-5). A truth, he says in

* We do not forget Ripalda and his "*fides laté dicta*." His was no mere question of words, but a very important question of doctrine. Its consideration, however, would be entirely external to our present theme.

effect, is "objectively certain" to me, if it be manifested to me by reasons which legitimately claim my absolute assent; and it is "subjectively certain" to me, if I proceed (as I am in reason bound) to yield that assent. Sometimes, he adds, the objective certainty of a proposition is exhibited to me with such irresistible clearness, as to necessitate my assent: such a proposition is not only "certain" to me, but "evident." Still, many propositions possess true objective certainty in my regard; while, nevertheless, their objective certainty is not so irresistibly clear to me, as to extort my assent to them: these propositions are "certain" to me, but not "evident." Whereas, therefore, the other philosophers, to whom we have referred, use the words "certain" and "evident" as synonymous within the natural order,—Cardinal Franzelin uses the word "evident" as denoting one particular class of "certain" propositions.*

Now, many persons will say as a matter of course, that, whatever truth may otherwise be contained in this doctrine, there is one region of thought, at all events, within which it can have no possible place—the region of pure mathematics. But, on the contrary, it is from that very region, that we shall adduce what we consider one of our most apposite illustrations. Let us first take a geometrical theorem: *e.g.*, "the angle in a semi-circle is a right angle." This theorem, we admit, as exhibited in Euclid, is "evidently" certain. Even here, no doubt, a continued exercise of Free Will is requisite, in order that I may carefully apply my mind to see the self-evidence of what I assume as axioms, and the validity of that reasoning which I base on those axioms. But, this process concluded, I have no longer the power of doubting the theorem. At the same time there may still be important work for my Free Will to do, in compelling my intellect fully to *realize* that theorem, which I have not the power to doubt. But now let us enter a more advanced portion of the mathematical region—the doctrine of infinitesimals. The Rev. Bartholomew Price, *e.g.*, in his admirable work on that subject, lays down such propositions as these: "There may be infinite quantities, infinitely greater than infinities;" "An infinity of the n^{th} order must be infinitely sub-divided to produce an infinity of the $(n-1)^{\text{th}}$ order;" &c. &c. ("Infinitesimal Calculus," pp. 16–20.) Mr. Price would consider that the truth of these propositions is as demonstratively established, as is any geometrical theorem: and we entirely agree with him. But am I, nevertheless—supposing I have mastered the demonstration—*necessitated* to accept them? Surely not. I have the power of

* We would especially refer our readers to M. Lapruné's second chapter, as containing a most admirable exposition of the part played by Free Will in the formation of genuine certitude.

allowing myself to be so bewildered by the strangeness of such propositions, as to withhold that assent which the adduced arguments, nevertheless (as I see), reasonably claim. I laudably, therefore, exercise my Free Will, in exciting myself to have the courage of my convictions; in compelling my intellect to disregard even insoluble difficulties, which may stand in the way of a demonstrated proposition.

And if this be so even within the sphere of rigid demonstration, how much greater scope is there for the laudable exercise of Free Will, where there is far greater opportunity of self-deception! Take, *e.g.*, such instances as those on which Cardinal Newman's "Grammar" mainly turns, and which are within the adjudication of what he calls "the illative sense." A Whig historian shall be dealing with the Massacre of Glencoe; and facts stare him in the face which, taken together, conclusively prove that the King had an active share in the transaction. Nevertheless, our historian shall refuse to deal honestly with himself. It is not further facts that he needs for a true conclusion, nor yet clearer apprehension of the facts which he knows. What he needs is, to deal honestly with himself by a laudable exercise of his Free Will. He *cognizes* premisses abundantly sufficient to claim absolute assent; but he refuses to *recognize* that they are sufficient.*

There is a large number of truths, then, which are "objectively" certain to me; but which I do not appropriate as "subjectively" certain, because my will fails in its proper duty. My will fails, we say, to contend duly against my prejudices or my indolence, and to enjoin on my intellect its one reasonable course. Now, the fact on which we would here lay special stress, is this. In no other case is there anything like such urgent need for the will thus intensely and energetically to exert itself, as in the Antitheist's dealing with Religious Truth. For this statement we can at once give two reasons, and need mention no others. In the first place, Religious Truth is inexpressibly *startling* to him. Consider one who has long been in the habit of contemplating this world as the only cognizable sphere of action, and of regarding his fellow-men as the only persons with whom he can cultivate any kind of relation. To one so habituated, the notion is bewildering beyond description, that this life is known with certainty to be no more than an infinitesimal part of his existence; that his

* Here a curious little psychological question may be asked. Have I the power of *recognizing*—of confessing to myself—that such or such premisses (known by me) reasonably claim my absolute assent to such or such conclusion; while, nevertheless (through indolence or the like), I fail to *elicit* such absolute assent. We are disposed to think the supposition a possible one; though, of course, in the vast majority of instances, pride would withhold me from such recognition.

relations with his fellow-men are comparatively of no importance, except in their bearing on his relations with an Invisible Eternal Being; lastly, that this Being created him, and—if He do not receive due obedience—will severely chastise him in a future life. Why the mathematical theory of infinitesimals is immeasurably less startling and bewildering to a learner, than are the doctrines here exhibited to such a one as we have here described. And we thus, indeed, come across a second truth, intended by M. Lapruné, when he says that religious knowledge is acquired by a kind of “faith.” I find the dogmata of the Blessed Trinity and Transubstantiation most enigmatical, startling, and perplexing. But my reason shows me that they cannot be proved self-contradictory; and I know certainly on God’s Word that they are true. I exercise, therefore, laudable firmness of faith, by enjoining on my intellect the acceptance of these enigmatical, startling, and perplexing dogmata. In a very similar way—when reason has proved to me the certainty of God’s Existence—I exercise firmness of religious assent by enjoining on my intellect the acceptance of that (if so be) enigmatical, startling, and perplexing truth. This “firmness of religious assent” is plainly very analogous to firmness of faith; though (as a matter of words) for ourselves, we see great objections against calling it “faith” at all. It may be worth while to add, that (in our humble judgment) there are Theistic truths cognizable by Reason, which are quite as enigmatical, startling, and perplexing as any disclosed by Revelation. To our mind, *e.g.*, the demonstrated doctrine of God’s Simplicity, when duly pondered, is even more enigmatical, startling and perplexing than is that of the Blessed Trinity.

Then, secondly, these religious doctrines are not only startling and perplexing to the confirmed Antitheist, but intensely repulsive. We have already dwelt on this, and will here only add one further remark. We are not wishing to speak objurgatorily but only to express our meaning, when we say that the ethical tenets on which our Antitheist acts, are precisely in the number of those which a Christian would describe as the tenets of corrupt human nature; the tenets to which man’s evil inclinations solicit him. Go back to the ages of faith. It was then the doctrine firmly held by all Christians—so firmly that the mass of them did not conceive any other as possible—that a man is really “virtuous” so far, and so far only, as he uses this life exclusively for his opportunity of serving God and gaining future bliss. Yet, notwithstanding this fact, there was an enormous multitude who “saw and approved” indeed “what is better,” but “followed what is worse;” who made earthly objects the end of their existence. Now the modern Antitheistic tenets precisely canonize what the mediævalists

anathematized; they represent the interests of this life as those which alone demand attention from a wise and good man. If corrupt human instincts (as the Christian calls them) were so influential even when the whole world accounted them detestable, how enormous will be their power in favour of a theory, which enables its advocate to pursue them without self-reproach. It requires a supremely energetic effort, in one enslaved by them, to recognize the certainty with which reason establishes a doctrine that condemns them.

You ask, says M. Lapruné (p. 387), for more light; yet it is not the increase of proofs which you ought to desire, but the weakening of your passions. Subtle and delicate passions, I admit, for you are an upright man [*un honnête homme*]; secret pride, which prevents you from yielding truth its due; invisible weaknesses, which perhaps do not lead you to neglect your social duties, but which make you traitors to the Truth; attachments, injustices, negligences—small, I admit, but multiplied—such as constitute a perpetual falsification of your supposed good faith, a perpetual obstacle to the Truth.

Our readers will remember, that the thesis with which we have been engaged is this: The acceptance of Religious Truth (we said) on the part of one who has hitherto repudiated it, will be due far more to active and conscientious exercise of the will, than to subtlety, vigour, perspicacity of the intellect. By what we have already urged, we shall have sufficiently established, we think, the *first* statement implied in this thesis; we shall have sufficiently shown what patient and sustained struggle of the will is necessary, in order that an Antitheist may embrace Theism. The *second* statement implied in our thesis is, that—whereas intense exercise of the will is thus requisite,—subtlety, vigour and perspicacity of the intellect are by no means equally needed. This statement can only be defended by showing that the Theistic arguments—if a man will duly contemplate them—are, in general, not such as to require rare intellectual powers for their appreciation. And this, of course, cannot be shown, until we come to deal with those arguments one by one. Here we can only express our own firm conviction that such is the case; and that the Theist, not being hampered by these tremendous adverse prejudices, can very readily and unmistakeably see, when duly presented, the irresistible force of the Theistic argument.

Meanwhile, even at this stage of our investigation, we can give no unsatisfactory reply to one particular class of inquirers, who (we fancy) exist in considerable and rapidly increasing numbers. An inquirer of this kind uses such language as the following: "You Theists," he says, "require me to believe in Theism as in an absolutely certain truth. In other words—whereas confessedly many of the greatest contemporary thinkers hold with complete

confidence that man has no power of cognizing God's Existence—you require of me, not that I suspend my judgment, but that I contradict their statement as confidently as they utter it. Now, I am intellectually a very ordinary and common-place person : how, therefore, can you expect that I should pit my own private judgment against the authority of these illustrious thinkers ?” * Now, if this language is merely used as a cloak and pretext for moral and intellectual carnal-mindedness or indolence, of course there is no scope for adverse argument, but only for ethical reprobation. We are convinced, however, that the difficulty here expressed is not unfrequently genuine. It is not indeed by any means so perplexing to deal with as might at first appear ; because (as Butler says on another matter) whoever is able really to experience the difficulty, is able also to apprehend the reply to it. We hope, in each one of our future articles, to encounter expressly this particular phase of what may be called “ Quasi-Antitheism.” And on the present occasion we would draw our inquirer's attention to three several facts, which (we consider) have been made abundantly manifest, by our preceding remarks, to any educated man of the most ordinary intelligence.

Firstly, it is manifest that—however conclusive and irresistible the Theistic arguments may be in themselves—there is no practical possibility of any Antitheist being convinced by them, unless he bring to their study a patient and sustained struggle of attention ; unless he energetically labour to remove that mountain of prejudice, which must otherwise intercept from him their view. Secondly, it is no less manifest to any man of ordinary knowledge and education who will exercise the simplest common sense and common observation, that these “ illustrious thinkers” do nothing of the kind. On the contrary, they consistently preserve the most supercilious and disdainful attitude towards Religious Doctrine ; nor do they show the faintest trace of a notion, that they are under any kind of disadvantage in religious investigations. Never were there men more densely prejudiced, or more densely unaware of the circumstance. From the mere fact, therefore, that they account Theistic arguments worthless, there arises not the faintest presumption that those arguments may not be (as we of course are convinced they are) entirely irrefragable. And here comes in the *third* phenomenon, to which we just now referred ; and which shows with quite extraordinary significance how perfunctory has been their examination of Theism.

* We happen ourselves to know the particular case of a gentleman, who in early life was a High-Church Anglican, but who gave up belief in God on the ground mentioned in the text. “ Who am I,” he asked, “ that I should oppose my own personal prepossessions to the declaration of these great men ?”

We mean that they always base their opposition to it on that extravagant tenet, which we have called "Phenomenism," and may here call "anti-Intuitionism." No one of the most ordinary education can read what we have said in the earlier part of our present article, without seeing the supreme absurdity of this tenet, as held by those who loudly proclaim themselves votaries of inductive science; or, indeed, as held by any one who admits that there is such a thing as human knowledge at all: and yet this transparently absurd tenet is advocated by these scientists without hesitation or shame. Surely these facts, taken in combination, are abundantly sufficient to show the most self-diffident man alive, how utterly destitute these thinkers are of all claim on his intellectual deference in matters connected with religion.

Having so far addressed those particular inquirers, who are frightened, not by the arguments but by the *name* of contemporary Antitheists, we now proceed rapidly to the conclusion of our present article. Whenever those philosophers, with whom we have been controverting throughout, choose to take up the Theistic controversy as a matter of argument and not mere flippant sarcasm,—they will be obliged to give up their transparently unsound contention that there is no such thing as a truth of intuition; and will be obliged to content themselves with alleging, that those particular intuitions which the Theist alleges are spurious. Here is a grave philosophical question, on which issue may be joined with every prospect of fruitful result; and it is only so far as Antitheists assume this attitude, that the Theistic controversy can become a serious philosophical discussion.

In the first article of our series (July, 1871)—following in the footsteps of Fr. Kleutgen—we set forth one particular principle as the only possible—nay, the only conceivable—foundation of human knowledge. That principle is, that whatever the human intellect (when its utterances are duly examined and interpreted) declares to be objective truth, is thereby certainly known as such. Metaphysics, then, is founded on Psychology: for the question whether this or that proposition be objectively true, depends on the question whether man's intellect genuinely avouches it. The human mind abounds in genuine utterances of objective truth, and precious results are attainable by examining and cataloguing its treasures. But there is always grave danger—so much we readily concede to Phenomenists—lest prejudice be mistaken for intuition; and this danger can only be met by vigorous and penetrating psychological inquiry. We submit that Intuitionist philosophers have not as yet in general given sufficient prominence to this psychological inquiry; that in dealing, *e.g.*, with the genuineness of this or that intuition, they have often not been at sufficient pains in sifting the relevant psychological

phenomena. We hope to explain what we mean by this suggestion, in our next article. At all events, this psychological examination of alleged intuitions will occupy a somewhat prominent place in our own reasonings.

And this criticism of Intuitionistic philosophers suggests a more general remark. Cardinal Newman says, somewhere, that he entirely refuses to be converted by "a smart syllogism." In a similar spirit speaks M. Lapruné. Religious "Truth," he says, "when unknown or forgotten, despised, misconceived, is not brought into the mind by the all-powerful virtue of a syllogism. Neither the excellence of Truth nor the mind's dignity permits this" (p. 384). And, certainly, if it be true (as we have alleged) that, by the very fact of engaging in Theistic controversy, we summon the Antitheist to a supremely energetic act of will—ones sees plainly that everything like flippancy or overbearingness of tone in the conduct of that controversy—or, again, any peremptory challenging of instantaneous assent and submission—may probably be productive of most serious mischief. The sincere inquirer must be allowed his full time, for patient consideration and healthy resolve.

To conclude. If, on the one hand, we have maintained that Theistic arguments are discerned as quite indubitably conclusive by those who will choose to give them prolonged and dispassionate consideration; on the other hand, what we have said will (we hope) powerfully illustrate the unspeakable blessedness of a religious education. It might seem difficult to exaggerate the blessedness of such education, even in the case of non-Catholics, who shall have been trained to regulate their whole course of life by those four doctrines, which we have included under the name of "Religious Truth." But happier—and quite indefinitely happier—is he, who has been from infancy a child of that Church, which infallibly preserves in their full purity the truths of Natural Religion, while supplementing them with a body of revealed dogmata, that brings out those truths into ever-increasingly clearer and fuller light.

In the next article of our series we hope to treat two distinct subjects. We hope (1) to combat what may be called "Agnosticism proper;" or, in other words, the tenet, that man's mind is intrinsically unable to apprehend the idea of an Infinitely Perfect Personal Being. And we hope (2) to exhibit the "ethical" argument for God's Existence; we mean the argument deducible from man's moral intuitions, and from the constitution of his moral nature.

WILLIAM GEORGE WARD.

ART. IV.—S. FRANCIS DE SALES : DOCTOR OF THE CHURCH.

1. *Concessionis Tituli Doctoris in honorem S. Francisci Salesii (processus)*. Romæ: Ex. Typ, S.C. de Propagandâ Fide. 1877.
2. *Œuvres Complètes de Saint François de Sales*. Paris: Blaise. 1821.
3. *Vie de S. François de Sales*. Par M. HAMON, Curé de Saint-Sulpice. 6^e Edition. Paris: Lecoffre, Fils, et Cie. 1875.
4. *Two Sides to a Saint—S. Francis de Sales*. By Rev. L. WOOLSEY BACON. *Macmillan's Magazine*, September. 1878.

ON the 16th November, 1877, by the Bull *Dives in Misericordiâ*, Pius IX. conferred on S. Francis de Sales the title of "Doctor of the Church." This important declaration was made on a petition, originated by Mgr. Magnin, Bishop of Annecy, with the Order of the Visitation, and supported by upwards of 600 cardinals and bishops, fifty heads of religious orders, princes and people innumerable. The cause was most carefully scrutinized and weighed, and unanimously approved by the Congregation of Rites. Cardinal Bilio, the author of the *Syllabus*, was the "ponent," or mover; Monsignori Salvati and Caprara, "Promoters of the Faith," the Advocate Alibrandi, who had filled the same enviable office for the Doctorate of S. Alphonsus, was "Patron of the Cause." In a folio of some 400 pages he has given us:—1. The text of the Bull and Decree; 2. An Account of the works and doctrine of the Saint; 3. The signature of those who supported the petition, with many of the actual *postulata*; 4. The objections of the Promoters of the Faith, and his own answers, as *patronus*. The book also contains portions, hitherto unedited, of S. Francis's "Controversies." The whole forms a magnificent justification of the new title, and we commend it to the attention of those who, ignorant of the process which had been going on for seven years, and perhaps unaware of the extent of S. Francis's influence in the Church, were somewhat surprised by the decree. And, indeed, while this authoritative decision demands the acquiescence of all faithful Catholics, it at the same time provokes a strong desire to know the reasons which moved the Holy Father to give it. Our object is to supply this information; to exhibit the nature and eminence of that doctrine which has deserved so high a distinction. It may

be well to say, first, what is signified in the style of the Church by this title, Doctor. It denotes one, whose writings may be quoted, not only privately, but publicly in the schools, with full authority as representing the mind of the Church. For this is, of course, required an extraordinary degree of acquired or infused spiritual science, but it is clear, as indeed the case of S. Alphonsus has shown, that antiquity, and the use of one of the Church languages, and various other conditions which have sometimes been supposed necessary for this title, are merely accidental. The sense of the Church is fully expressed in the Bull :—

For although antiquity alone makes *distinguished* those holy doctors who flourished in the first ages of the Church, and their works have the *ornament* of the Greek or Latin tongue, still the thing most important, and indeed absolutely necessary for this office is, that celestial doctrine should appear in writings beyond common measure . . . such as, by fulness and variety of argument, as by splendours surrounded, may pervade the whole body of the Church with a new light.

Leo XII. tells us that *writings* are required that her doctors may “continue, even when dead, to teach the faithful of Christ.”

The qualifications of doctor are more technically summed up by Benedict XIV. :—“*Eminens doctrina, insignis sanctitas, declaratio summi Pontificis, aut Concilii Generalis*—Eminent doctrine, distinguished sanctity, legitimate conferring of title.”* The Bull itself fulfils the last condition, and contains both the assertion and the proof of the eminence in doctrine. It first gives the extrinsic proof from his “reputation, great during life, but most great after death :”—

For that the doctrine of S. Francis, while living, was held in great esteem may be gathered from this, that of all the strenuous defenders of Catholic faith living at that time, Clement VIII., of sacred memory, chose out the Provost of Geneva to go to visit Theodore Beza, the chief upholder of the Calvinist plague. The esteem enjoyed by the holy Bishop is no less shown forth in that Paul V. when the celebrated discussion, *De Auxiliis*, was proceeding at Rome, willed that the opinion of this holy prelate should be asked, and, following his advice, decided that this most subtle and dangerous question, long and too bitterly agitated, should be set at rest by imposing silence on the parties. Again, if the letters written by him to many persons are considered, it will be evident that Francis was by many consulted on questions of faith and practice . . . like one of the greatest among the old fathers (*ad instar gravissimorum inter veteres Ecclesie patres*); . . . and that his influence was so great with Popes, princes, magistrates,

* “*De Serv. Dei Beatif.*,” l. iv. p. 2.

and clergy, that by his zeal, exhortations, and advice, countries were purged from heresy, Catholic worship restored, and religion extended.

This opinion of his excelling doctrine was, after his death, not lessened, but greatly increased. Alexander VII. of sacred memory, in the Bull of Canonization (1665) declared Francis de Sales "celebrated in doctrine, admirable in sanctity, the remedy and protection of his age against heresies." Nor differs from this what he said in a letter to the nuns of the Visitation at Annecy (1666), that "his virtue and wisdom widely pervaded the whole Christian world," that he himself considered "his doctrine as quite divine," and had chosen Francis "as the chief guide and master of his life." Clement IX. says that "by his magnificent (*præclarissimis*) works he made a pious armoury for the benefit of souls." Benedict XIV. did not hesitate to declare that his books were written with "science divinely acquired;" he solved difficult questions on his authority, and called him "the most wise director of souls."

We have many testimonies to add to this magnificent tribute of praise; but while we have thought well to give this one authoritative proof of the "*eminens doctrina*," we must now vindicate the "*insignis sanctitas*" of Francis de Sales. This is, of course, abundantly certified to faithful Catholics by the Bull of Canonization; still the attacks of enemies have become so much more fierce as S. Francis's honour and influence have increased, that it becomes necessary to make a distinct defence on certain parts of his life and character. Rightly is holiness required for moral teaching, especially in a writer like S. Francis, whose every word is practical. Even to Our Blessed Lord's teaching it was His life that gave power—"Jesus began to do and to teach." If Francis was not able to carry out his doctrines into practice, if he was either a hypocrite or a fanatic, his works had better perhaps have remained unwritten; they serve only to countenance the calumny, that virtue is a name, or above the powers of man. We have singled out the most recent and perhaps the most virulent of these attacks. It is directed almost entirely and professedly against the Ritualists, who, trying to steer their usual middle course, have deserved the contempt of Catholics by disfiguring the character and truncating the works of the Saint, and still more angered the Low Church party among themselves. To the "lowest" degree of this party the writer of the article we refer to, the Rev. Leonard Woolsey Bacon, seems to belong. In *Macmillan's Magazine* for September, 1878, he brings together, under the title, "Two Sides to a Saint," all that even spite can say, with any pretence to truth, against S. Francis. We suppose that credit must be given him for honesty of purpose; and we notice that he has recently directed his clever and facile pen against that monstrous imposition, the American Bible Society.

But here all praise must stop. His ignorance of the subject on which he writes is only equalled by the unscrupulousness with which he sacrifices truth and charity to support a false and foregone conclusion, sometimes simply to construct a smart sentence. We are quite aware that we have still to justify this statement, but we make it beforehand because the power of this article to mislead has been strongly proved by the fact that two so-called Catholics have already published bitter attacks against the Saint on the authority of this author. Indeed, he writes with a speciousness and easy assurance which might well make even true Catholics uneasy, having, perhaps, only an *à priori* conviction and general impression to oppose to his categorical statements and flowing narrative. For this reason, we begin by begging our readers to dismiss all fear that they may have to lower, by even a hair's breadth, their estimation of the Saint. We undertake, without art, without any tricks of style or appeals to the imagination—such as form the staple of Mr. Bacon's romance, written for the most indolent and superficial class of magazine readers—to overthrow entirely his structure of misrepresentation and calumny. We will use no other materials than those which he triumphantly allows us—S. Francis's own words, and the statements of approved biographers.

His fundamental and irremediable error is the Protestant notion of a Saint. S. Paul speaks of a certain kind of man "who cannot discern what is of the Spirit of God; for it is foolishness to him."* To such the most correct and most moderate statements are extravagances, and, preconvinced, he opens Catholic books merely to find details. All facts have but one meaning. To such men, S. Francis, after the description, whether true or false, of his early piety, remains "a solemn little prig" (p. 385); his zeal for souls is only personal ambition (p. 400); his supernatural discretion, and making himself all to all are only a "practical shrewdness," "a taste and talent for diplomacy of the sort that approaches intrigue," or, in the case of women, "a sort of coquetry;" in a word, his sanctity is only "sanctimony" (pp. 385-6). But Mr. Bacon goes much further than this; and, while professing merely to remove "some rays of the halo which envelopes him," he really presents him as an object of scorn and hatred. He says (p. 388):—"If a document nearly as scandalous as the letter above quoted had been produced in a recent *cause célèbre*, in which the character of one of the most famous of modern preachers was at issue, it would have gone hardly with him before the jury." And (p. 402):—"One tires of seeing this adroit and courtier-like fanatic, with his duplicity and

* 1 Cor. ii. 14.

cold-blooded cruelty recommended as 'a model of Christian saintliness.'" And he speaks, on the same page, of "the ferocious and perfidious dragonnades by which he extinguished Christian light and liberty."

Beginning in this spirit, it is a mere chance where he goes astray; and he would continue to maintain the same thesis even if forced to admit that the particular proofs which he had selected were incorrect. We must content ourselves with appealing to an unprejudiced tribunal, and with exposing the falseness of the definite charges. Our first duty is to settle the authorities. Mr. Bacon refers to S. Francis's letters, and to the authentic life by Charles Augustus de Sales, nephew of the Saint; and of course we admit all that he can prove from such sources. But his real and chief authors are Gaberel, the Protestant historian of Geneva; and, among Catholics, Marsollier and Loyau d'Amboise. He condemns himself at the outset, before all competent judges, by ignoring the standard life of S. Francis de Sales, by M. Hamon, *curé* of S. Sulpice, which is named at the head of our article. It had reached its sixth edition in 1875, three years before Mr. Bacon wrote, and is entirely founded on original letters and the sworn depositions of eye-witnesses. Mr. Bacon is evidently quite ignorant of the existence of this great work. Our readers must not suppose that we are unable to defend our Saint even by the witnesses Mr. Bacon brings forward himself; but it is not worth while to delay over hearsay evidence or personal opinions when we have suitable eye-witnesses. We need say nothing of the hostile and mendacious Gaberel, because Mr. Bacon, though really following him in every point, professes to rest his case on Catholic authorities. But we must quote M. Hamon's opinion of these latter, premising that, while S. Francis died in 1622, Marsollier did not write till 1700, after some twelve biographies of the Saint had appeared, and d'Amboise only in 1833. In his "Introduction," Hamon calls the former "perhaps the most unfaithful of biographers;" and he gives in a note the following justification of this opinion:—

James Marsollier, Canon-Regular of Uzès, persuaded these canons to ask for secularization from the Holy See. The journeys and correspondence about this matter required money, and to get it he wrote the life of the Abbé de Rancé, a life so filled with errors that it is forbidden in all monasteries of La Trappe. We know not whether the same motive guided his pen in the composition of the life of S. Francis; but what we do know is, that instead of consulting the monuments of history he generally consulted his own imagination, as if he had meant to compose a romance. For example, he never quotes but two authors—Augustus de Sales and Cotelandi, designating the latter "anonymous." The first is

generally quoted wrong. The second, composed in 1687, an historical romance rather than a life of the Bishop of Geneva; and Marsollier boldly copies all his fables.

Hamon proceeds to give a list of thirty of his principal errors, "a list," he says, "which it would be easy to augment." This life was dedicated to Madame de Maintenon, and would seem to be framed to correspond with many of the false ideas of that day. The sweet and simple character of the Saint becomes quite distorted and subtilized, and is buried under *la politique*. The last paragraph of the third book seems to strike the keynote of the work—a note sadly out of harmony with one's idea of a Saint's life, but quite in accord with the views of the age of Louis Quatorze—"When policy is supported by piety it can effect everything. We have just seen an example of it in the conversion of the Chablais. It will be followed by many which will appear in the course of this history."

This man Mr. Bacon calls "the most authoritative of the Saint's biographers." All that Hamon has to say of Loyau d'Amboise is contained in a note to the same "Introduction." We italicise one important passage, reminding our readers that it was written years before Mr. Bacon's article appeared:—

We do not mention the life of S. Francis by Loyau d'Amboise. . . . It is even worse than the work of Marsollier and Cotelandi. . . . From p. 41 to p. 49, he details the loves of S. Francis de Sales and Mdlle. de Végy, a *ridiculous story of which he is the first author*. . . . The whole of this life is a phenomenon of eccentricities.

Coming now to the substance of Mr. Bacon's article, we find, as the first proof of a general charge of duplicity, that Francis, having engaged and reciprocated the affections of a young lady, perfidiously abandoned her in order to accept the provostship of Geneva, which he had meanwhile secretly secured. We have just seen the whole authority there is for this "ridiculous story." Marsollier makes him appear a little weak in expressing his determination not to marry on account of respect to his father, but says distinctly that the young Count gave the lady no encouragement whatever, and only incurred his father's reproaches for what appeared his unreasonable coldness. He says also, as for that matter so does d'Amboise, that the provostship was procured by his cousin, entirely without his knowledge, as probably the only means of inducing M. de Boisy* to consent to his son's giving up the brilliant secular career before him, and accepted most reluctantly by Francis, from the same motive. Far

* This was the true name of S. Francis's father. Marsollier always incorrectly calls him M. de Sales.

from desiring it, he positively refused to accept with it the dignity of Senator of Savoy, which was offered to him. This reluctance and refusal were of a piece with his whole life. He was without ambition. The coadjutorship and bishopric of Geneva were simply forced upon him, and he refused such dignities as the Cardinalate and the See of Paris. Francis's state of mind and course of action are fairly epitomized from M. Hamon, in the *Tablet* of March 13, 1880, and exhibit a perfect union of prudence and simplicity in a most difficult position. The telling bit of Mr. Bacon's special-pleading here,—“his mother, with her woman's heart, pleading tenderly for the forsaken girl,” and reproaching her son for his dishonourable conduct, falls particularly flat on those who know that she had almost worshipped her son from his babyhood, four months earlier given her maternal consent to his holy design, and actually prepared the ecclesiastical dress for him against the day of his father's consent.

We may take together the charges of levity and coquetry, and also of duplicity in the Saint's relations with women. Mr. Bacon is good enough to say: “Francis, in very trying circumstances, proved himself as pure as the average of Protestant ministers, and that is high praise.” We thank him for expressing this conclusion, because he would seem to insinuate a very different one. But how can we expect this man to understand the pure, single-minded love of God with which S. Francis joined his soul to that of S. Jane Frances, and trained her for their mutual work for their Master? He loved her, indeed, with both a natural and a supernatural affection, and was not afraid to express either the one or the other, in their proper relations; but the lower was raised and sublimed by the higher, and these two Saints on earth were “as the Angels of God.” So with other women, whose souls he loved, and whom he helped according to their necessities, as being their father, and, as he said, “not the bishop of men only.” If Mr. Bacon would trace out in his life, from youth to age, the history of the precautions he took against even the most distant approaches of sensuality, his three days' fast in each week, his hair-shirt, his temperance, his guard of the senses, his continual watching and incessant prayer;—if he would read, in the early pages of the “*Esprit*,” the strict rules which he laid down for his conduct in necessary intercourse with women, so as to avoid not only temptation, but even the chance of scandal, Mr. Bacon would not have dared to make his contemptible remarks. On two occasions, indeed, he was placed suddenly in the fieriest heat of temptation; but it will be seen at once, from the accounts either in Hamon or Marsollier, that these were quite unavoidable, and became for him the very triumphs of chastity. Mr. Bacon censures the Saint for addressing a young

lady as "dearest girl of my heart." The original is, "*ma très-chère fille de mon cœur*," and the dishonesty is the greater here because he professes to quote the Ritualistic translation, which is, correctly enough, "Very dear child of my heart." As the *Tablet* says (*ib.*), "We fail to see any impropriety in these words of a venerable bishop of fifty-one to his spiritual daughter. As to the "clandestine correspondence" with S. Jane Frances, here is the case. She had had a well-meaning, but very indiscreet director, who had made her promise, intending to prevent scruples and anxiety, to manifest her conscience to no one but himself. Such a promise could not bind her, when producing, as it did, a far greater disquiet. This was the subject of a confidential letter. It was necessary to observe absolute secrecy, and it was quite justifiable so to tone the letter which the Confessor expected to see, as not to let him think it was written with design. "Still," continues the Saint, in a passage which Mr. Bacon is careful to suppress—"still I have written it with all truth and sincerity, and I should always do so, but not with so much liberty as this."

We now take those charges of treachery, violence, cruelty, and seduction, in the conversion of the Chablais, which form the substance, and by far the largest part, of Mr. Bacon's invective. Naturally S. Francis's chief glory produces the fiercest attacks. We will devote to this question the rest of our paper.

The Mission of S. Francis in the Chablais is faithfully and fully described by Hamon. When we consider the completeness, and rapidity, and stability of its success, its almost insurmountable obstacles, the magnificent display of Apostolic virtue, which, without miracles, and without external pressure, subdued the bitterest hostility and most inveterate prejudice, we can scarcely be wrong in calling it the greatest event of its kind in the annals of the Church since the days of the Apostles. It lasted four years, beginning on the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross September 14th, 1594; but to understand the state of things at this date, we must go back to 1536.

In that year, the Bernese, taking advantage of a rupture between France and Savoy, treacherously, and without declaring war, entered the territory of the latter power, occupying Gex, and that part of the province of the Chablais which lies on the west of the river Drance, divided into the bailiwicks of Thonon, Ternier, and Gaillard. Of these, Thonon, containing the town of the same name, the capital of the Chablais, was by much the most populous and important, and was the chief scene of S. Francis's personal labours, though the whole district came under his influence.

During a few weeks the usurpers allowed the exercise of the

Catholic religion ; but after a great tumult in Thonon, excited by the determined opposition of the people to the sermons of the heretical ministers, they strictly forbade it, drove out the priests and religious, sold or demolished nearly all the churches, broke the crosses, and bells, and images—in a word, committed all the excesses usual with the self-styled reformers, such as had been committed in Geneva by the Bernese in the year before. In 1564 Savoy recovered power and prestige by the victories of Emmanuel-Philibert, and succeeded in peacefully regaining possession of Thonon and Ternier, on condition of maintaining the Protestant religion there. This condition was faithfully observed for twenty-five years. But in 1589, the city of Geneva, now grown powerful, joined with the Bernese to take advantage again of the troubles of Savoy, and re-occupied the two bailiwicks. They were quickly driven out by Charles-Emmanuel, son of the last-named duke, who thus recovered his ancestral dominions, freed from the condition of maintaining the Protestant religion, not only by the perfidy of the other party to the contract, but also by a formal treaty. This was the treaty of Nyon, concluded the same year, 1589, not with Geneva, which he did not recognize at all, but with the Bernese, in which it was stipulated that the Catholic religion should be free everywhere, while Calvinism should be tolerated only in three places, of which it was expressly stipulated (*Article 4*)* that Thonon should not be one. We are not aware whether the treaty of 1564 was also signed at Nyon, but this one of 1589, of quite a different nature, is the treaty of Nyon, which both the Bernese and S. Francis refer to on various occasions. Even, however, had they been of the same tenor, it would not affect the real state of the case. The treaty of 1589 was scarcely dry when the Calvinists, excited by France, invaded the Chablais again, and a desultory war ensued, lasting till 1593, ruining the miserable country, but ending with this advantage that by the articles of a *truce* (Oct. 1593) the duke received unconditional possession of the districts of Thonon and Ternir, not renouncing his right to Gaillard, which he soon afterwards gained, or Gex, which ultimately came into the possession of France. Under this *truce* S. Francis was sent, as will be amply proved from the quotations we are about to make. And we have S. Francis's express statement, in his letter to Clement VIII. (*Lettres*, i. 49) :—

Charles-Emmanuel, in the very instant of the beginning of the truce, the state of things being hardly settled (*rebus viâ stantibus*), feeling himself delivered from the unjust condition, immediately asks the bishop, my predecessor, to send preachers.

* See "Opuscles," p. 88, and "Lettres Inédites," No. 43, note.

We see, then, the worthlessness of Mr. Bacon's statement, that in 1594 the treaty of Nyon, which he ignorantly confounds with the treaty of 1564, was "reaffirmed." And with this we dismiss the accusation of "perfidious disregard of treaties."

We may imagine, then, the state of this country in the year 1594. Its old religion had been destroyed, and a new religion violently substituted in the generation previous. The old was only known through the false statements of the ministers, and was looked on with fear and dislike. Its ruined monuments remained, signs of its weakness and of the triumph of the new doctrines, a poor omen of S. Francis's success. During the five years, between 1589 and 1594, it had changed its profession of faith according to the changes of the war, until religion had become little more than a name. In a letter to the Nuncio at Turin (*Ib.* 24), S. Francis says:—

On the re-occupation by the duke of his ancient patrimony, many of the inhabitants, moved rather by the noise of bombs and arquebuses than by preaching, returned into the bosom of the Holy Roman Church; these provinces, having then been infested with the incursions of the Genevese and French, returned to their slough.

He thus describes the state of the country:—(*Ib.* 49.)

When we entered those bailiwicks, sad indeed did everything appear. For we saw sixty-five parishes, in which, except the officials of the duke, there were not, among so many thousands of persons (*ex tot millibus*), one hundred Catholics. The churches, partly stripped, partly in ruins; nowhere the sign of the cross, nowhere altars; and everywhere all vestiges of the ancient and true faith destroyed; everywhere ministers, *i.e.*, teachers, of heresy.

At the end of four years the whole country was Catholic, the parishes organized, churches being restored, and scarcely one hundred Calvinists remained. The Catholic and true explanation of this stupendous change is, that the power of Christ's Church, as exhibited in and by her saintly minister, triumphed over error and sin. Mr. Bacon's explanation is summed up in the word, *persecution*. We will take his division of S. Francis's mission into two nearly equal periods. Only in the latter does he assert the use of actual violence; but he ingeniously prepares the way, by proving, as he pretends, the utter failure of all legitimate means of conversion, in spite of every advantage, during the first two years. His account of these offers the following outline. He starts with the assumption that as an envoy of the duke, Francis was aided in his work by a "prodigious combination of influences." He was "flush of money and resources of every kind, backed by the treasury and army of Savoy, and perhaps the best protected man in Europe." Similarly, conversion would be attended by

"vast worldly advantages." Therefore the refusal of the people during the first two years to declare themselves Catholics, was because they were "so heartily attached to their faith." And he puts out of court, as preposterous, all statements of suffering or perils incurred by S. Francis.

We begin by exposing the utter hollowness of the assumption on which this account rests. The duke, indeed, sent Francis, and gave him letters to the municipal authorities of Thonon, and to the governor of the fortress of Allinges, three or four miles from that town. But then he seemed to forget his existence during these two years, while the governor was able to do nothing more than ensure him a safe night's lodging. The cause of this strange supineness was the wars and complicated State affairs in which Savoy was at this time engaged. These belong to the general history of the time; we are concerned with the effect, or fact, which is amply proved from the letters which Mr. Bacon is good enough to let us put in.

I speak, then, now, says the Saint (*Let.* 49), of what I have seen, and of what, so to speak, my hands have touched, so that I should be beyond shame if I lied; most silly if I were ignorant of anything.

In a letter to Blessed Canisius, of April, 1596—*i.e.*, a year and a half after the mission began—S. Francis says (*Let. Inéd.* 29) :*—

Although the affair was begun by his authority, he gives no heed to it, being embarrassed by other things.

In a letter of President Favre's, of about the same date, we read (*Let.* 12) :—

I learn every day of your victories, which grow greater and greater. But it is a sad thing of which you so justly complain, that an affair of such importance is treated so coldly by those who ought to favour it . . . in these times, too, in which a truce of so many months should be giving good hopes.

In a letter of S. Francis to the duke, of September, 1596, he says (*Let.* 32) :—

This is the second year we preach here at Thonon without much fruit, both because the inhabitants will not believe that we have been preaching by your highness's orders, only seeing us supported from day to day, &c. . . . Even the expenses incurred up to this are not yet paid.

* In Blaise's edition of the "*Œuvres*," there are five volumes of "*Lettres*" and two volumes of "*Lettres Inédites*." Mr. Bacon seems to be quite ignorant of the existence of the latter, though they have been published fifty years, and form the complement of the other letters.

And in a *mémoire*, attached to this letter, he says :—

Their highnesses commanded that means of support should be provided. This not having been done, the inhabitants will not believe that we are here by their will.

And a few weeks later he declares (*Opuscles*, p. 75) :—"I have already employed twenty-seven months in this miserable country *at my own expense*." Mr. Bacon actually quotes this sentence, leaving out the words italicised. We must remind our readers that M. de Boisy positively refused to help his son, in order, if possible, to force him to renounce so dangerous and hopeless an undertaking. The Saint subsisted entirely on the little means his mother was able secretly to send him.

But not only was the Duke, in his distant Court of Turin, unable to help the mission, but there was a strong and desperate party on the other side. The little country was entirely open to those of Berne and Geneva who were willing to strain every nerve to support their political and religious aims, and who had, as we have seen, proved their power. The Chablais was overrun with their emissaries and ministers, and the Duke's influence, as yet, had no force among the people compared with theirs. It would not be to Mr. Bacon's purpose to mention, and he probably did not know it, that S. Francis was not the first preacher sent into the Chablais at this time. A few months before him a M. Bouchut had gone to Thonon, but had fled on the destruction of the Château by the townsfolk and the Genevese. Even this insult the Duke could not attempt to avenge till nearly five years later. But if his credit was not great enough to save his own fortress, and he had not leisure to punish such an outrage, what could he be expected to do for his envoy? Still more direct proof is afforded us by the letters of this period. S. Francis says to Pope Clement VIII. (*Let.* 49) :—

The Bernese, Genevese, and such like children of perdition, by their emissaries, deterred the people from hearing our sermons, declaring that the truce was but a truce; peace not made, that presently Duke and priests should be expelled by force of arms, and heresy flourish again.

Again, and more distinctly, (*Let.* 5) :—

The obstinacy of this people is so great that it has been forbidden by public ordinance to come to Catholic sermons; and when we hoped some would come . . . we have found that all have resolved the same, with mutual exhortations; and they make this excuse for their crime, that if it was known they leaned ever so little towards the Catholic religion, they would be maltreated by the Bernese and Genevese among whom they live, not only as Catholics, but also as apostates; and therefore we cannot expect

them till peace is absolutely made. . . . It is, then, not enough that we take from them heresy, we must first take away love of this world.

This, indeed, is the real clue to the difficulty of converting these people. We do not maintain that they had any attachment to the Catholic religion ; indeed, as known to them by the false representations of their ministers, it would be a just object of abhorrence ; on the other hand, they had no attachment to Calvinism ; they were far more anxious about this world than about the next, and therefore, as we shall show, while S. Francis, a little later, got them to see the doctrine's truth, he could not get them to embrace it till they were secure.

Mr. Bacon talks of the liberty of conscience guaranteed by treaties. It is a mere figment under such conditions as these, when the one party could not, and the other would not, carry it out. It supposes, at the least, security for life and property under either of the tolerated religions ; and such protection of the State as is given to secure this is no interference with liberty, but simply the weight necessary to keep the balance true. But at present even such protection was absent, and we shall see further proof of this as we proceed. The accusation, then, of Catholic proselytism resolves itself into the fact of Protestant tyranny. We are now in a position to bring forward the statements of Catholic biographers—statements which Mr. Bacon ridicules, but against which he has no better argument to show than the hypothesis we have just exploded. The real history of these first two years, instead of being a record of failure in spite of every advantage, is one of success in face of every obstacle. Indeed, the history, especially of the first few months, is little but an account of these obstacles ; the "sewing in tears to reap in joy." When we give no other authority, our reference will be to M. Hamon. This subject occupies his Third Book.

During the first ten months—*i.e.*, till July, 1595—S. Francis accepted the hospitality of the Governor of Allinges, going out daily to preach and instruct in Thonon or elsewhere. Mr. Bacon sneers at the pleasant daily walk into the town, as if this were represented by Catholic writers as an heroic work. For that matter, S. Francis went to reside in Thonon after ten months. It is not in this that they magnify his fortitude, but in his long excursions into the country wilds, preaching three or four times a day. These apostolic journeyings Mr. Bacon ignores, though he contradicts himself elsewhere by asserting that "in the country villages they refused not only to hear him, but even so much as to give him a lodging on payment." It is on authentic record that he could not even buy bread, that on one occasion he and his cousin only saved themselves from being frozen to death by taking

refuge for the night in the village bakehouse. On December 12, 1594, benighted in a wood frequented during the deep snow by packs of wolves, he had to tie himself to the higher branches of a tree, and was found by some peasants next morning utterly benumbed and almost dead. Many a night he passed in the ruins of a church, or under the eaves of the inhospitable houses. His devotion caused him labours which his preachings did not indeed directly require, but which were no doubt one of the great causes of success in preaching, not only by drawing down the divine blessing, but also by the example of his piety and self-sacrifice. The weary journey to Allinges, after the labours of a day in Thonon or in the country, was simply to say his daily Mass, which he never omitted. And after he took up his residence in Thonon, he would every day cross the Drance into the Catholic part of the Chablais for the same purpose, in the winter (of 1595-6) over a frozen and slippery plank, at the risk of his life. In the winter, too, these pious journeys were often traced in blood, on account of severe chilblains, from which he suffered, and which his indefatigable activity never allowed to heal. Whatever Mr. Bacon may pretend, the winters of the Chablais are very rigorous; that of 1694-5 was exceptionally severe. And the summer furnished opportunities of heroic example equally effective. We read of a nobleman, named Bouvier, whose conversion, years later, sprang from having seen the Apostle preaching to the peasants in the open air, with head uncovered, under the burning sun of the Chablais. But any difficulty in his work coming from personal hardships, was of no importance compared with that which was caused by the action of the ministers. His character was decried; he was proclaimed everywhere as impious, a spy, and a sorcerer. He says, (*Let.* 6):—"Our heads are threatened by so many evils (clades), that there seems no hope of advancing piety here." Not only his doctrine, but his person also was represented as a fit object of aversion, and even of attack. The people were instructed to flee his conversation as a pestilence, and there can be no doubt that his life was frequently attempted. According to the principles of the more consistent Calvinists, it was lawful even for private individuals to take the life of such a servant of Satan as Francis was represented to be. A Protestant deposed on oath, after his conversion, that on the 8th January, 1595, he thrice posted himself on S. Francis's route, from Thonon to Allinges, and thrice drew trigger upon him, but each time the gun missed fire. Afterwards, he several times placed assassins in his path, but the Saint escaped them in ways which seemed miraculous. On the 1st July, 1595, he was attacked on Mount Voiron, while attempting to re-establish a shrine there of our Lady, by the infuriated country-people, and barely escaped with his life.

On the 18th of the same month, he and his faithful attendant, George Roland, were attacked by two assassins on their way to Allinges, but he disarmed them by his majesty and intrepidity. A few days later, when he first began to sleep in Thonon, several men broke into the house with the intention of taking his life; but though he was really there, God did not allow them to discover him. As late as Ash-Wednesday, 1597, the observance of the ceremony of that day provoked a tumult in Thonon, which nearly cost him his life. Mr. Bacon's assertion that the Saint makes no reference to these attacks would, if true, only prove his courage and his humility; but, as a fact, we find a distinct reference to one of them. He is reassuring his father, after a terrific account given by Roland of the affair of the 18th July (*Let. Inéd.* 28) :—

If Roland were your son, as he is but your valet, he would not have grown cowardly for such a little skirmish as this, and would not make out of it the report of a great battle. *The evil will of our adversaries cannot be doubted*; but you are wronged by anyone who doubts our courage.

Besides these, there remained the great and fundamental obstacle. "Faith is by hearing." Fear and prejudice prevented the people from listening to him. And, as he says (*Let.* 8, November, 1595) :—

Private obstinacy was not enough. . . . In public council the chief inhabitants of Thonon* have sworn together never to go to the Catholic preaching. . . . This happened the day before yesterday in the town hall.

But the Apostle was not daunted by such dangers or difficulties. In the same letter he says :—

I think I see what they want . . . to *compel* us, having lost hope of doing anything, to go away. But we otherwise (*atqui nos contra*) : as long as the articles of the truce and authority of superiors allow, we shall keep on . . . entreating, rebuking, exhorting, in all patience and doctrine. And not only must sermons be preached, but *sacrifices must be offered*, if we are to succeed in this combat, that the devil may find he helps, rather than injures us, by these arts.

Finding it impossible to get a hearing for his spoken word, he began, in January, 1595, the writing and distribution of small tracts on the Catholic doctrine. Mr. Bacon insinuates that he adapted his teaching to the circumstances, and dishonestly concealed the true nature of Catholic doctrine. This is a fair specimen of the method, and at the same time of the utter worthlessness, of his argument. He calls the proceeding "characteristic of the

* Under the direction of the ministers, as appears from the rest of the letter.

man," asserts "that it was charged against him by his own brethren that he was not honest in the matter," and implies that the book had afterwards been suppressed. Thus he seems to make out a strong cumulative argument. The tenor of our article must furnish an answer to the first point. All that there is of truth in the second is, that *three years later* some of S. Francis's fellow-workers made a complaint to the Bishop about the mildness of his manner with heretics. The good fathers, who feared to encourage them in their delusions, and who had not reached that height of supernatural charity which is also the highest truth, complained that "he forgot himself so far as to call the heretics his brothers." (Hamon, i. 286.) Will Mr. Bacon take exception to this? As to the book "that would have settled the question," but "completely and mysteriously disappeared from the face of the earth," will it be believed that the mere remains of it form, under the name of "Controversies," one of the largest volumes of the very edition of the Saint's works which Mr. Bacon is using? If S. Francis had been preaching before the Pope and Cardinals, he could not have put Catholic truth more fully or uncompromisingly. We quote a short passage given in the *processus* from the autograph, discovered, during the Vatican Council, among the Chigi MSS. :—

The Church cannot always be joined in general council. . . . In the difficulties, then, which occur daily, to whom can we better address ourselves . . . than to the head of all? . . . Now all this was so, not only in the case of S. Peter, but also of his successors, for the cause remaining, the effect remains. The Church has always need of an infallible confirmer, to whom it can turn; of a foundation which the gates of hell, and particularly error, cannot overthrow; and that its shepherd should not be able to guide his children into error.

We shall give directly another strong proof of S. Francis's out-right preaching of this great doctrine; and we suppose even Mr. Bacon will admit that, if he preached this, there was little use in softening down anything else. We hope our readers will pardon us for adopting our statement of facts to Mr. Bacon's *ad captandum* and discursive narrative.

We now resume our brief history of the events of the first two years. Gradually these writings, with the spectacle of his heroic virtues, and the reports of his eloquence, made by the Catholics who heard him daily, began to produce an effect; and the entire conversion, early in 1595, to a Christian life, of the Catholic garrison at Allinges, by his sermons and example, naturally produced an excellent impression. We find him, after nine months, telling the President Favre (*Let. v.*) that, in spite of their hostility :—

Still in private conversations the ministers have confessed that we drew good conclusions from the Holy Scriptures about the mystery of the most august Sacrament of the Altar, and all the rest would confess the same, but for this immoderate worldly fear.

We learn the conversion of the Duke's chief judicial officer, or procurator, in Thonon (before the end of 1595), from the well-known history, recounted, with an exquisite modesty, by the Saint himself. (*Esprit*, ii. 27.) In many ways it bears out what we have been saying:—

One Sunday, when the weather was very bad, there were but seven persons in the church; wherefore some one told me it was not worth while to preach. I answered that . . . provided somebody was edified, it was enough. So I mounted the pulpit, and I remember that my sermon was on prayer to the saints. I was treating this subject very simply . . . when one of the audience began to weep bitterly, and even to sob and groan out loud. I thought he was ill, and invited him not to constrain himself too much, telling him we were ready to cease speaking, and to help him, if necessary. He answered that his body was well, and begged me to continue, because I was dressing the right sore. The sermon, which was very short, being finished, he came and threw himself at my feet, crying out, "Reverend Provost, you have saved my soul to-day. Blessed be this hour, which is worth an eternity to me!" And then he told me that having conferred with some ministers on the subject of prayer to the saints, which they had represented as a horrible idolatry, he had fixed the next Thursday for again abjuring Catholicism, but that he had learnt the truth from the sermon he had just heard.

He continued in words which S. Francis does not give, but which we learn from Charles-Auguste:—"I came into the church, and finding only a few poor peasants there, I said to myself, 'If the Provost only preaches for God he will give his instruction all the same; if he preaches for his own glory, he will despise such a small audience. He will not preach, and I shall know that he is but a charlatan and a preacher of lies.'" The Saint concludes his anecdote with these words, to which we call particular attention:—

I cannot tell you the impression which this great example, given among so few people, made in the whole country, and how it made hearts docile to us, and susceptible of the Word of life. I could tell you similar cases, and even more remarkable.

This was the sort of thing which converted the Chablais. To second this movement, the Provost went through the towns and hamlets, preaching thrice or four times a-day, and giving most of the nights to confessions and preparing his instructions. Such zealous labour was indeed almost too much for the weak body, but it is not hard to believe that it bore a great fruit, espe-

cially in lessening the prejudices against him ; and early in 1596 he was able to preach with safety in the market-place of Thonon, being heard by many. In the Lent of this year he writes (*Let.* 13) :—

A wider and more consoling field opens . . . but a little and M. d'Avully and the syndics would have come to hear me . . . on the Blessed Eucharist . . . but not daring publicly, on account of their oath, they heard me from a secret place, if my weak voice was able to reach them.

M. d'Avully was the great bulwark of Calvinism in those parts ; a man of high birth, position, and character. His opinion of his Ministers was greatly shaken by their unwillingness to meet S. Francis. He soon discovered that this proceeded from their inability to answer him, and after a most complete and searching examination of his teaching, he gave in his submission to the Church which sent him. This was on the 4th October, 1596,* a day which S. Francis always kept with special commemoration, looking on this conversion as the beginning of the death-blow to Calvinism in the Chablais. Previously had been converted a famous lawyer, named Poncet, and a certain number of others. We have no wish to magnify the number of actual conversions up to this date. We are not looking for heroism from the majority of these people. Yet little less was required from those who at this time were converted. We have already seen what to think of Mr. Bacon's "vast worldly advantages." The poorer sort were actually obliged to leave the country to find the means of livelihood. Poncet's friends renounced him, and gave out that he was possessed by the devils. He had hesitated for a long time, knowing that he would lose his business, his friends, and his property (*Let. Inéd.*, 39, 40). The very fewness of the conversions is itself an argument against Mr. Bacon. It is not in human nature to resist such attractions as he pretends to have been set forth. For our part, we do not assert that the country *professed* itself Catholic in the face of every contradiction. We maintain, indeed, that the real cause of conversion was the grace and truth of the Church ; but we also admit that before this cause could act universally, it was necessary to remove those obstacles of fear and self-interest which have been indicated.

* Shortly afterwards (Mr. Bacon wrongly says, previously) he was present at a conference between S. Francis and the Minister, La Faye. He admits that the report of this discussion has not been preserved, but presents us, from Gaberel, with the account of a similar one later. Any one acquainted with the style of the Saint will see at once that it is the fabrication of an adversary. Replying, *ad hominem*, we need only point to the effect on M. d'Avully, as the best testimony we possess of the real facts.

The actual state of the case was this. At the end of the second year's preaching all was beginning to ripen towards the harvest; there was in some cases actual conviction, in others a strong and growing impression that the Catholic was the true faith; whilst nearly all were friendly to the saint, and prepared to listen to him. Catholicism no longer meant superstition. But there was not detachment enough in many cases to give up all that made life dear. The actual profession of the Catholic faith still meant the risk of earthly ruin. Two letters of S. Francis make still clearer the actual position of affairs. The first was written a considerable time earlier, and thus furnishes an *à fortiori* argument. He says (*Let.* 9):—

One party does not wish to hear; the other excuse themselves on the risk they would run if the truce were broken, had they made the smallest show of approval of the Catholic reasons; which fear so holds them that they fly all they can our very conversation. There are some quite persuaded of the faith, but we cannot draw them to the confession of it during the uncertainty of the event of this truce.

A still more decisive passage occurs in a letter (*Let. Inéd.* 35) to the Duke, of this very date, which forms a suitable conclusion to our account of the first part of the mission:—

Sire, the disposition in which I now see the people of the Chablais is such, that if in the execution of your highness's holy intention, the churches at Thonon, and some other places, were restored, I hesitate not to say that in a few months almost the whole of this country would be converted. Since in the town so many are so well disposed, and the rest so uneasy in their consciences, that if the occasion offer, they will infallibly take the direction your highness wishes. And as for the rest of the country, there have already come separately ten or twelve parishes to ask for the exercise of the Catholic religion, so that the time is come to see God praised, and the zeal of your highness effective.

We arrive now at the second two years of the mission. Mr. Bacon having prepared the way by his supposed proof of utter failure up to this point, in spite of every advantage, on account of the attachment of these people to their faith, delivers his chief attack on S. Francis. He dares to explain the undeniable fact of the complete conversion of the Chablais, by saying that, other means failing, S. Francis had "unscrupulous resort to violence." This, we say, is his chief attack; but we have prepared our main answer to it in our treatment of his introductory charges. Our object has been not only to bring forward the truth about these, but at the same time to show that there is no need of any further cause to explain the course of subsequent events. The internal change had already taken place. What need was there to force

or bribe the people to do what they were willing and anxious to do? Instead of having, as Mr. Bacon pretends, to account for a complete and absolute change, we have simply to show the same causes producing their natural and final effect under propitious conditions.

But as we have undertaken to give a definite answer to the different heads of accusation, and as Mr. Bacon has expended on this portion of his article all the resources of his rhetoric, we will follow him step by step. His "causes" of the conversion of the Chablais may be summed up in three: severe edicts of the duke, procured by Francis; the actual use of a regiment of soldiers to force the profession of Catholicism on the people; the supreme pressure of the State, forcing them to choose between Catholicism and expatriation. We can take minor charges with these.

And first, as to the severe edicts. It is true that at the end of the second year's preaching, the Duke began to awaken to the actual position of affairs, sent for Francis to Turin, and asked him what might be done to further the conversion of the country. The measures he proposed were chiefly the restoring of the Mass, sending more preachers, and spreading Catholic worship. There is, indeed, a *mémoire* of S. Francis, which Hamon places in October, 1598, but which would seem to have been *presented* now, in which some stronger measures are proposed, as suitable to be adopted, "*après quelque temps*." But in any case this is not the place to take it, because, whether presented or not, it was not acted upon till the date M. Hamon fixes, when the country was practically converted; and we will examine it without blinking when we come to that time. We will only say here that its chief aim was the observance of the treaty of Nyon (1589), as to having no exercise of Protestantism in Thonon. As to Mr. Bacon's main point, that he proposed "to scatter terror through the country by wholesome edicts," this is a mere invention of the anonymous author he refers to. There is no sign of it, or of anything approaching to it, in any document, and instead of furthering, it would have injured the Catholic cause. Yet this he underlines, and puts forward as representing the spirit of all the measures proposed; he returns to it again and again, and colours his whole narrative with it. But, at last, the question is not what was *proposed*, but what was *done*. All that S. Francis really obtained was an assurance of the Duke's good-will, a promise of support for more missionaries, and, what he wanted most of all, permission to say Mass in the church of S. Hippolyte, which had already been given to the Catholics to preach in. Mr. Bacon pretends that he carried out this permission in a way which took the magistrates quite by surprise, and was calculated to "scatter terror;" but it was really

done in a perfectly open manner. Marsollier says he "hastened" to present his letters of authorization to the magistrates, and his intention was known all over the town. The first Mass was celebrated on Christmas Day, 1596, and thenceforward it was offered daily, and on great feasts solemnly, in Thonon. We cannot exaggerate the importance of this. We do not expect Mr. Bacon to appreciate the supernatural power of the Holy Sacrifice; but while he can scarcely call it violent persecution to perform the Catholic service, he would see, if he understood the dislike and fear with which it had formerly been regarded, that no stronger proof could have been given of the strengthening of the Catholic feeling in the Chablais, than the public celebration of Mass in the capital. About February of this year, M. Favre, President of the Senate of Savoy, went to live in the neighbourhood. He conversed with the people and impressed them more by the example which in his exalted position he gave of a Christian life, than by any words he could have used. He came partly at the request of S. Francis, and of course Mr. Bacon entirely misrepresents his visit. He places it as early as 1595,* pretends that M. Favre "scattered terror" in order to get the people to come to the Mass of Christmas Day, 1596, and says that his visit was in consequence of a request to the Duke from S. Francis, to send him as a Commissioner to compel the people to attend his preaching. Saint Francis really asks (*Let. Inéd.* 32):—

That a senator might come, and call the citizens together, and in his magistrate's dress invite them to listen to, hear, sound, and nearly consider the reasons which the preachers propose on behalf of the Catholic Church, from which they had been torn without reason by the violence of the Bernese.

This saying Mass and visit of M. Favre (who called no assembly, and did not appear in his official dress), with an increase in the number of priests, as the process of conversion advanced, were literally *all* that was done at this time beyond what had been done in the first two years. The rest was the same; summarized in the word *preaching*, but preaching in its noblest sense, by example and by word, the preaching of a saint. "By preaching," said S. Francis (*Esprit*, iii. 5), "this heresy is maintained, and it will only be destroyed by holy preaching." Words deeply to be laid to heart by all who are striving to bring back a nation to the faith. But now preaching was *heard*, now the sacrifice of the Mass gave efficacy to it, and now the stability of the work began to be secured by organization and the appointment of settled pastors.

* He is misled by the mistaken date at the head of the letter. But if he had taken the pains to read it, he would see that it was a considerable time after the conversion of M. d'Avully, Oct. 4, 1596.

As Saint Francis had said that many parishes were anxious to profess the Catholic religion, so now, with some security of the Duke's protection, they began. Three were organized early in this year, 1597. The ceremony of Ash-Wednesday, while it gave great offence, and nearly led to S. Francis's martyrdom, was a means of more strongly confirming the idea of sacramental grace. Immediately after this a great victory of S. Francis over Viret, the Calvinist minister of Thonon, on the question of the perpetual virginity of Mary—a point generally admitted by the so-called Reform—with the minister's dishonest conduct on the occasion, led to the conversion of Fournier, the first syndic of Thonon, and many of the chief citizens. These wrote a letter to the Holy Father (*Let.* 23), in the name of the town; and we commend it to the attention of Mr. Bacon as another proof that S. Francis neither made nor had made any disguise of Catholic doctrine, as his observance of the ceremony of Ash-Wednesday shows that he made no disguise of Catholic practice:—

We know with what love you cherish us, but a little while ago your wandering sheep, now come back to the fold. This is certainly beyond doubt, which from the very beginning (*statim ad initio*), we have heard on the part of those who have brought us forth into the Gospel of Christ, viz., that there is on earth one Supreme Pastor, to whom Christ has so absolutely, so universally (*tam indistincte*), committed His sheep, that He clearly did not speak of some, but assigned all, and who, besides His daily instance, has the solicitude of all the churches. For we acknowledge in your Beatitude the supremacy (*principatus*) of the Apostolic priesthood, and a zeal corresponding to such an exalted station.

The Lent of this year brings us to the second of Mr. Bacon's proofs of violence; the one on which he lays the greatest stress, and makes the strongest appeals to the imagination of his readers. We will give his own words, to show the bitterness of his *animus*. After stating, quite incorrectly, that from the time of the Saint's visit to Turin, he was helped by a great force of priests, he continues:—

But our Apostle had lost faith in such methods of evangelization, and looked for something more effective. Of any ordinary force there was no lack already in the Garrison of the Allinges, and other military posts which were under his orders, and which held the wretched country in complete subjection. But there was need of something "to scatter terror;" and our saint knew of just the instrument for the purpose, if only he could lay his hand upon it. The "Martinengo regiment" was a name that had only to be whispered in all that region to make the blood run cold with horror. It was a regiment of Spanish mercenaries, that had been trained in the American wars to an exquisite delight and ingenuity in human torture.

Mr. Bacon entertains his readers with an account of the horrors which they were said to have practiced *elsewhere*, which we content ourselves with simply denying, till some better authority is given for them than the word of Mr. Bacon or Gaberel.

Evidently the Martinengo regiment was exactly what Francis needed for his Apostolic work. What he wanted was not soldiers, but those particular soldiers. . . . At the Apostle's request this horde of devils was billeted on the towns and villages of the Chablais. . . . From this point the work of conversion was simple, straightforward, and rapid. The new missionaries showed great devotion to their work of confiscation and banishment.

As Mr. Bacon professes to make a new departure in the estimation of S. Francis, our readers must excuse us for answering seriously this extravagant calumny. It will now be no surprise to hear that S. Francis had nothing whatever to do with the coming of these soldiers. Mr. Bacon does not even produce a fragment of authority for saying that he had. Marsollier tells us that the people were astonished at their coming, and does not say a word to imply that S. Francis's surprise was less than theirs. He was absent from Thonon at the time. On his return, Marsollier says that the officers of the regiment waited on him to offer their services; but Mr. Bacon is careful to suppress the concluding words. "S. Francis only used their deference to make them live in order, and to be as little burden as possible to the inhabitants." We hear no more of them, except (and here we may thank Mr. Bacon for his description of their previous crimes) that S. Francis converted them all to a practical Christian life, so that they did, indeed, by their good example, help his missionary work. Their arrival was quite independent of his mission. It was part of a general plan for getting the Chablais gradually again in hand. It was the placing of a garrison at Thonon, such as had already been at Allinges. Far from attempting to use such means for religious ends, S. Francis was particularly cautioned to be extremely careful in carrying out his own mission. At this very date M. Favre tells him (*Let. Inéd.* 47):—

The President of the Council wishes you to continue to say Mass in S. Hyppolyte, but he does not think it good that you should have an altar* carried into the church . . . so as not to give occasion to any new disturbance in a time so critical as this.

And again (*Let. Inéd.* 46):—

While we all approve what you have hitherto done, for the rest we all agree that you must go no further without the express order

* In place of a wooden one hastily patched up for the Mass of Christmas Day, 1596.

of the Duke, so as not to constrain him to come to the violent remedies which would be necessary if these gentlemen committed some insolence in the form of contempt or rebellion.

Considerably later the Bernese threatened to make war on the Duke unless the Capuchin preachers, men rather bolder in their expressions and method than the prudent and gentle Saint, were commanded to desist from preaching. As to S. Francis's own principles, it would be enough to appeal to his general character; but, fortunately, we have several distinct instances of his opinions and practice in such matters. The first, when the Governor of Allinges, after the attempt upon his life which we have mentioned above, begged him to accept an escort of soldiers. He replied:—

St. Paul and the Apostles did not employ soldiers. They used only the sword of the Divine Word . . . Luther and Calvin, on the contrary, spread their heresy by sword and fire, by force of temporal power. This is a reason for me not to act so . . . Suffering and trust in God are of more avail than a legion of soldiers.

And we have an instance still more to the point, when there was question of some troops passing through Thonon, in 1598. Francis writes to the commandant (*Let. Inéd.* 57): "We beseech your eminence, with all the humility possible, and conjure you by the bowels of Christ and the blood He has shed for souls . . . that you would deign to take another route." . . . And yet we are asked to believe that, in complete violation of his principles, and with a fiendish hypocrisy, he set murderers to preach the gospel of peace. We are asked to believe that while the authorities were afraid of provoking a revolution by sending a new altar into a Catholic church in which Mass was already said, they did not hesitate to set hell-hounds loose upon the people. And we are told that the Bernese, who would not tolerate the preaching of an earnest Catholic friar, stood patiently looking on while their co-religionists were outraged and massacred.

We may now resume our outline of the actual course of events, not thinking it necessary to delay to answer in detail Mr. Bacon's accusation of the use of bribery and seduction. What he calls by these names was merely the charitable help necessary to keep from starvation the victims of Mr. Bacon's upholders of liberty of conscience. This help soon ceased, because, as the country became more Catholic, the need of it ceased.

The bringing of the Martinengo regiment to a holy life, which was attended with many striking circumstances, produced a great effect in the country. Conversions multiplied rapidly, and the organization of parishes continued *pari passu*. Shortly

after those we have mentioned, came twelve others, and parish priests began to be appointed, each at first serving several parishes. Catholic services and preaching were to be found in many places; a few zealous men joined the Saint in preaching about the country. These were supported, not "with salaries that had been pledged to the exiled Protestant pastors," but by private liberality, and by such ecclesiastical revenues of the Chablais as had been saved from the Calvinists and given in trust to the Knights of SS. Maurice and Lazarus. The ministers, who were never once interfered with by Francis or the State, convinced that the Duke was in earnest, and seeing their cause was hopeless, retired of themselves, and the field was left open to Catholic influences. It would have been impossible for S. Francis to do all the work that was now required, and he gladly attributed the marvellous success to others; but the chief glory of these, as of the earlier days, belongs to him. It was still his virtues and his preaching, his wisdom and his learning, which stirred the people to the depths, which regulated the great movement, and tempered zeal with prudence and with charity. From the beginning of 1598, the people began to come over *en masse*. The Jesuits were then established at Thonon, and Fr. Humæus alone is said to have received 10,000 persons in six months,* a fact which remarkably fulfils the Saint's prophecy, in his letter to B. Canisius of 1596 (*Let. Inéd.* 29):—"If they are once favourable to my words, God will send a great number of skilful workmen, of your society and others. These will finish their work in a few days."

We mention, in passing, that in September of this year occurred the *only* miracle ascribed by Catholic writers to S. Francis through-

* Common report would not be proof of the number of conversions, but certainly tends to prove the number of inhabitants, and is enough, by itself, to overthrow the absurd statement of Mr. Bacon, that the whole district contained but 4,000. This was the population of the town of Thonon alone. On his own showing, what becomes of the "towns and villages of the Chablais" on which his "horde of devils was billeted"? What was the use of "the garrison of the Allinges, and other military posts"? The districts of Thonon, Ternier and Gaillard, with their eighty-four parish churches (*Opuscules* p. 84), formed, as we have said, the most populous part of the whole province of Chablais, which contained over 60,000 persons. We have seen S. Francis speaking of the "many thousands of souls." Gex contained upwards of 22,000, M. Hamon says 30,000. We are safe in taking these figures from the census of 1848, because Mr. Bacon avers that since the days of S. Francis "a blight" has fallen on the country. The number 72,000, which is given, with the qualification, "it is said," in the Bull of Canonization, includes all the conversions effected mediately or immediately by him. The Sœur Madeleine de Chaugy says (*Vie de S. F. de S.*) he received 11,000 himself, and was the means of conversion to 60,000 others.

out the whole four years. In the same month, the famous "Forty Hours" of Thonon were held, in thanksgiving for the Treaty of Vervins (May 2, 1598), which assured the Chablais to Savoy, and removed all fear of the Bernese. It furnishes three remarkable proofs that the country was now practically Catholic. No protest was made by the rapidly-decreasing body of Calvinists, when the bishop, finding St. Hippolyte far too small for this great solemnity, took over and reconciled the great church of St. Augustine. Through the whole time of the devotion, there streamed in and out of the church processions from different parts of the Chablais, some to beg for admittance into the true fold, others to thank God for the gift of faith already received. At the end of the ceremony crosses were solemnly erected in Thonon, and were carried triumphantly by the different bands of pilgrims to be placed throughout the whole country. We may well repeat, then, that the Chablais was now Catholic, and any subsequent action of State authority could be at most the protection of a converted country. We come now to this action of the Duke, which forms the third point of Mr. Bacon's proof of "violence," and which he presents as the real and final cause of conversion. The exact dates are of importance here. The Duke was to have attended the solemnity just mentioned, but could not arrive in time. It was determined to celebrate a second "Forty Hours," at which he and the cardinal-legate assisted. He arrived at Thonon on the 30th September. It was his first visit after the rebellion of 1594, and when he arrived within a short distance of the town, he declared his intention of punishing this crime. All were filled with consternation. M. de Vallon, the chief Protestant in the district, after the conversion of M. d'Avully, went with the consistory to beg S. Francis to put himself at their head, and implore the mercy of the Duke. It was easily granted to such an intercessor; and though this fact only furnishes Mr. Bacon with an opportunity for a sneer, it was the occasion of the conversion of M. de Vallon, and of many others, previously unconvinced.

On the 1st October, before the grand opening Mass, came the abjuration of many gentlemen of the Chablais, and citizens of Thonon, headed by the Minister, Petit, a man of the greatest consideration among the Calvinists up to the moment when he declared his intention of becoming a Catholic. Early in the afternoon of the same day the legate, attended by the Duke, returned to the Church to receive abjurations. First came a multitude from many parishes united; then a body of from 500 to 600 people. These had scarcely moved away, when other groups presented themselves, so that some one had to remain ready the whole time to receive them. S. Francis speaks

(*Let.* 49) of the many thousands whom the legate actually saw received. Of course all these had been instructed before the Duke's arrival.

On the 3rd or 4th October appeared envoys from Berne, asking for Calvinism the same liberty in the Chablais as for Catholicism. We invite particular attention to the Duke's reply: "When you usurped this province you forced the people to embrace your new opinions; and now that my just arms have recovered it, and almost all my subjects (*la presque totalité*) testify a desire for me to re-establish the old and true religion on the same footing as before, you should not find it strange or wrong that I, their legitimate sovereign, claim the right, if I please, to regulate the affairs of religion according to their desires" (*Ch. Aug.* p. 179). And the next day, when they pressed their petition, he said, "I agree, if you will also receive Catholic priests at Berne."

Their refusal is enough alone to condemn them as advocates of toleration. We see, then, the true state of things. Mr. Bacon carefully keeps all this out of sight, and he proportionately disfigures the final scene which occurred on the 6th October, but which he erroneously places after the 12th. We have learnt to understand his style. The "shuddering citizens," the "Spanish butchers," the "bloodthirsty Duke," with "his inspiring genius . . . Francis de Sales," stripped of his stage dresses, become simply a public audience, in which the sovereign, attended by his guards, declares his intentions about the country. He told them that he considered those who would not hear his preachers to be his enemies; and declared that if they continued obstinate, he would deprive them of their offices, make them feel his indignation, and even banish them from his dominions. S. Francis explained, in words utterly different from those Mr. Bacon puts into his mouth, that the Duke only wished them to listen to the preachers.

Those who refused even to allow the Catholic proofs to be presented to them were exiled, several returning shortly afterwards at the intercession of the saint, and finally entering the Church. The Duke's conduct is related and well explained by M. Hamon. It was his personal action, dictated as much by political as by religious motives. We are not concerned to defend him, though we could easily do so. But now we admit that S. Francis himself renewed the proposals which, in 1596, he had asked to have carried out *après quelque temps*, meaning, no doubt, after the conversion of the country, which had now taken place. We have shown the course and state of things; we have shown that the Chablais had become Catholic with no "scattering terror," no use of the sword, no illegitimate influence of any

kind. What we have to say refers not to the conversion of the country, but to its preservation in unity of religion. We do not think it necessary to defend the restitution of Church property, made now, and not before, to the original owners. The ministers were gone; those who did the work had a right to the fruits. We shall not either stay to defend the general application of Church law to this country, such as forbidding unorthodox books and teaching. We can reduce what we have to say to two points. S. Francis certainly asked that the ordinary civil law which made heretics ineligible for public functions might be carried out. As we have seen, the Calvinist magistrates and functionaries were mere instruments of foreign religious tyranny. There was no chance of *freedom* in the exercise of the Catholic religion so long as these agents of Berne remained in office. *Three years later*, also, he asked (*Lett. Inéd.* 68), "that those who refused to profess the Catholic religion should leave the States of Savoy with leave to sell their goods;" but he gives his reason, showing that he does not put this pressure on them on account of their religion; "their affection is already perverted, and they follow their Huguenotism rather as a party than as a religion."

But we would put this matter on a broader ground than the mere justification of it in this particular case. We quite admit, as all Catholics must admit, that S. Francis of Sales acknowledged in the state a right and a duty to protect and to further God's revelation, to defend the people—especially the poor uneducated people—from external attacks upon their faith or morality, nay, from their own proneness to error and vice. He would consider it lawful, in certain cases, to make the profession of heresy a note of disgrace, to punish it as other crimes are punished. To deny this is to assert that religion is only a matter of opinion or emotion, that God's revelation is uncertain, or unimportant. We speak in the abstract. We declare, with still greater earnestness, that he would make the *application* of these principles depend on circumstances, particularly on the state of religious opinion in the country, the existing law, the spirit of the age. Speaking generally of modern days, we say that justice and charity imperatively demand the toleration of religious differences. We consider that the circumstances of the case under consideration justified such action as S. Francis is responsible for.

With this we conclude our defence of the work of S. Francis in the actual conversion of the Chablais; but we have still to answer a bitter attack on a subject closely connected with it. Mr. Bacon makes S. Francis stimulator and accessory to an attempted escalade of Geneva, on the 12th of December, 1602. To begin with, such words suppose a crime, and the

escalade was no more a crime than the taking of Paris out of the hands of the Commune. It is a question of history, of politics and war. Geneva was the Duke's rebellious city. Taking advantage of his embroilments, it had invaded his other States with horrible ravages, and forced them into rebellion. He had never granted peace. The remarks of Francis, *six years before*, had reference to this state of things. As recently as the year 1600, Geneva had offered, when Henry IV. invaded Savoy, to seize again on the Chablais. The Duke did not recognize the new *status* of the city till 1604, when peace was made, and, after a desultory war of seventy years, thenceforward faithfully kept. The motive, again, which Mr. Bacon insinuates did not exist. Mr. Bacon asserts that, "to get possession of Geneva, and to be enthroned there, not only as bishop, but as secular prince, was one of Francis's earliest and latest dreams." He is probably ignorant that the rights of the bishops, as temporal princes of Geneva, had been ceded to the Dukes of Savoy as early as 1518.* And, as to his spiritual rights, when told on his deathbed that he would live to be seated on the throne of Geneva, he said: "The throne of Geneva! I have never desired it, but only its conversion." (Hamon ii. 307.) But why do we delay on this? All we have to show, whether the escalade was justified or not, is that the Saint had nothing to do with it. Mr. Bacon says he was making his retreat before consecration in Annecy, when the baggage-train passed through it, and could not have been ignorant of its destination. He quotes a letter of S. Francis to his canons, in which he expresses a hope that he will soon see them in their "own city;" and he says S. Francis's confessor was the priest who heard the confessions of the escalading party. All this would be a poor proof at best, but we happen to have the exact dates, and to be able to overthrow the whole of it. In the first place, S. Francis was not in Annecy at all. He had chosen for his consecration-day, from devotion to the Blessed Virgin, the feast of her Immaculate Conception (December 8th), which fell, in 1602, on the second Sunday of Advent, and he had gone to make a preparatory retreat of *twenty days* at Sales. He was consecrated in the family church at Thorens, and chose, again from devotion to our Lady, the following Saturday, *two days after* the attempted escalade, for his entry into Annecy. In the letter to the canons, S. Francis refers, not to Geneva, but to Annecy, which was at this time the "own city" both of bishop and canons. This is clear, from the very words written at Sales: "I salute you from here, hoping soon to see you in your own city, to which I desire the peace and consolation of the Holy Spirit."

* Maimbourg : "Hist. de Calvin," l. i. p. 37.

His confessor was Father Forrier (Forerius), who was directing his retreat at Sales. There was a Scotch Jesuit in the country about this time, named Forbes (Forbesius), who may have acted as chaplain to the soldiers. We suppose Mr. Bacon has confounded the two names. But what are we to think of the man who concludes such a miserable tissue of errors with the words: "We should wrong his blessed memory if we were to say that his guilt was demonstrated? But many a wretch has been hanged with less evidence of complicity in less atrocious crime."

We trust to have now destroyed all ground of confidence in this writer, and here conclude our defence of the "distinguished sanctity," hoping soon to fulfil the more pleasing, though not more important duty, of exhibiting the "eminent doctrine" of our great Doctor.

ART. V.—RECENT WORKS ON THE STATE OF GERMANY

IN THE FIFTEENTH AND BEGINNING OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY, BY GERMAN AUTHORS.

PART II.*

THE second volume of Dr. Janssen's work, under the title of "State of the German People from the beginning of the Politico-Religious Revolution to the end of the Social Revolution of 1525" ("Zustände des deutschen Volkes seit dem Beginn der politisch-kirchlichen Revolution bis zum Ausgang der socialen Revolution von 1525") embraces the first eight years of the preaching of Luther and his followers. The author characterizes this epoch as a period of religious and social disturbance, and not as a time of reform. He divides his subject into three books. The first contains the history of the Humanities, as they were studied at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century (Der jungen deutsche Humanismus), their anti-Christian tendency differing from the tendency of the preceding period, when the promoters of the renaissance at the beginning of the fifteenth century sought in the study of the classic authors fresh support for Christian doctrine.

* The first half of this Essay appeared in the DUBLIN REVIEW, July, 1881. It may be well to state that the entire paper was written by Professor Thijm, in January of last year, and that the appearance of the concluding portion in our pages has been unavoidably delayed until now.

As we have already remarked, we are specially indebted to Dr. Janssen for the clear distinction to be drawn between the philosophers of the beginning and those of the end of the sixteenth century; other writers have merely alluded to it.* In this first book our author describes Erasmus of Rotterdam, the leader and model of the young philosophers; also John Reuchlin, who rendered such good service to the study of Greek literature, but who is more famous as the author of an original version of the Old Testament; "Because," said he, "the study of eloquence and poetry causes many not only to neglect the Holy Scriptures, but even to despise them" ("Die heilige Schrift wird nicht bloss vernachlässigt, sondern bei Vielen wirklich verachtet," p. 37). Dr. Janssen relates how Reuchlin became a defender of the Jewish books of the Testament, when they were attacked by the University of Cologne and by the converted Jew, Pfefferkorn, and how this attack became a pretext for other young philosophers to advocate the same views, and to declare war against scholastic learning and Church authority. Ulrich von Hutten was of their number; he was a favourite of that ambitious Bishop Albert of Brandenburg, who indirectly aided and abetted the revolution, seeing therein a favourable prospect of his own aggrandizement, and his independence of the See of Rome. Lastly, our author describes the relations between Luther and Hutten and the young philosophers at the moment of the revolt.

In the second book, Dr. Janssen gives an account of the development of the movement against Catholic doctrine; of the Diet at Worms, where Luther had to explain his conduct; of the deception which followed; of the revolutionary movement at the universities of Erfurt and Wittenberg; of the predatory expedition of Francis of Sickingen, and his useless efforts to annihilate the constitution and the empire; of the decay of morals and charity; of the labours and failures of the Diets, &c. In the third book, the period is shown to us from the social point of view; the influence of the doctrine of Huss, and the communistic and democratic features of the civil war; its development, its progress and its termination, bought by the death of thousands of victims.

Let us now see in what manner our author works out the task he has set himself. And we may well begin by bearing testimony to his impartiality; that is to say, to his justice towards his adversaries. He gives fair field to writers holding contrary opinions, in order that events may be judged by their consequences. Every page affords proof of this. He unfolds to us the system of

* For example, Herr Binder, one of the chief editors of the "*Historisch-politische Blätter*," in his monograph, "*Charitas Pirkheimer*," 1st edit. p. 40. Freiburg im Brisgau: Herder, 1873.

Luther, not by aid of what has been written about him by others, but with the help of Luther's own writings. After having proved, in the first volume of his history, that the study of theology and philosophy flourished at the universities, and in Germany generally, in spite of the irregular lives of many churchmen, and of abuses which had penetrated even to the pontifical throne, the author proves in the second volume that the revolution of the sixteenth century, far from putting an end to a period of sottishness, dulness and lethargy, overthrew study, morals, and the consciences of men to such an extent, that the year 1525 found Germany exhausted by the enmity and hatred of princes and preachers, by the civil warfare of class against class, by the interruption of study and the decay of all the schools. Luther himself complains bitterly of this last evil, in 1524.

As we have just said, it was Gerrit Gerritszoon (Gerard, the son of Gerard), who is known by the assumed name—partly Latin, partly Greek—of Desiderius Erasmus (*desiderare*, ἐπᾶν), who led the movement; insomuch that the papal legate, Jerome Aleander, who was sent to Germany to publish the bull of excommunication against Luther (p. 145), was of opinion that Erasmus was the foundation-stone of the heresy ("fomes malorum"), and much worse than Luther (p. 149). We think, nevertheless, that both the legate and Dr. Janssen judge Erasmus with a little too much severity.

Erasmus considered Luther responsible for the revolt of the peasants, and the war ensuing ("Bauernkrieg," p. 570); and Ulrich von Hutten, in his turn, accused Erasmus of betraying the Gospel-cause (p. 252). But the abuse of a man so utterly perverted as was Hutten can only prove honourable to Erasmus.* The latter had begun his attempted rationalistic explanation of the Holy Scriptures, and his effort to create by this means an alliance between the Humanities and Theology. He spoke contemptuously of the theological science of the Middle Ages, and he distorted Christian truth by viewing it from quite a Pagan standpoint.

Agricola, Wimpheling, Geiler of Kaisersberg, and the philosophers in general of the beginning of the fifteenth century, held, on the contrary, that the works of the Scholastic Theologians of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries might serve as an introduction to the study of the Fathers of the Church, and they opposed the exclusive and exaggerated study of the Pagan writers—"The adulterous passion for reading the poets;"† they also combated the attempted disuse of the mother-tongue (p. 4)

Erasmus thought he had made known to the whole world new principles of study. He declares that "his books are read by

* See Höfler, pp. 345-350.

† Dacheux, p. 469.

all the people on the face of the earth, and that such another as he would not appear again for centuries to come." He sought the favour of princes, and the gifts and incense offered at his shrine inflated his vanity, and prompted him to excessive abuse of his adversaries. His passions occasionally blinded him; he could not always even see clearly the questions he endeavoured to discuss. His writings abound in contradictions; indeed, in this respect he rivals Luther. Sinking deeper and deeper into scepticism, he at last came to deny the fundamental doctrines of Christianity—the Holy Trinity and Original Sin (p. 13); and in his work, "The Praise of Folly," whose fame is to be regretted, he ridicules, under cover of science, the Bible, the Papacy, and even a prayer of Our Lord's (p. 15).

Still we think Dr. Janssen's description of Erasmus somewhat exaggerated. Viewing the mystic side of Christian doctrine with indifference, approaching religious truth only with the light of reason, sceptical as regards many of the assertions of the great theologians, as cold and calm in the face of the ecstasies of the saints as in presence of the impetuosity and excitability of Luther, Erasmus stood in the midst of extremes, and got into disgrace with the faithful of the true Church and with the propagators of the "Pure Gospel." Some Catholics never despaired of his return to the true faith, and his countryman, Hadrian VI., had hopes of attracting him to the Roman court, there to defend the principles of the faith against the heresies that were invading Germany.* He might have been certain, says Herr Höfler, that a cardinal's hat awaited him. Herr Pastor, the author of the "Reunionsbestrebungen," seems, in his opinion of Erasmus, to keep a just medium between Dr. Janssen and Höfler. Appreciating the difficulty of judging fairly this remarkable man, he takes the same view as does Herr Kerker in his biography of Erasmus.† Herr Pastor has the merit of having laid stress upon the ironical disposition of Erasmus, which has been specially treated in a work written by Ph. Woker.‡ This side of his character received its development principally from his intercourse with the English people, and particularly with Sir Thomas More.

Pastor describes Erasmus as the leader of the Middle Party (Haupt der Mittenpartei), who, even under Clement VII., believed in the possibility of a union of the different opinions, without giving up any point of Catholic doctrine. The following fact affords another proof of the position occupied by

* Höfler, "Adrian VI." p. 333.

† Pastor, p. 130. Kerker, "Erasmus" &c., in the *Tubingen University Review* (*Quartalschrift*), 1859, p. 531.

‡ "De Erasmi Studiis Irenicis." Paderborn, 1872.

Erasmus. By his advice, a college, styled, "Of the three Languages," had been founded at the University of Louvain: this institution became so famous that Francis I., jealous of its success, sent to ask the co-operation of Erasmus in founding a similar one in Paris.*

Erasmus, who dedicated his version of the New Testament to Leo X., should be ranked among the "expectants" (*expectantes*), of whom Herr Pastor takes special notice (p. 115), and amongst whom there were many who, being deceived in their expectations, afterwards turned their backs on Lutheranism. The author observes truly that the lives and characters of these men have been too long forgotten. As to Erasmus, he was too undecided, too indifferent and sceptical, and even too vain, ever to admit frankly that he had erred; and the adulation paid him by the young students only strengthened him in his opposition. These last, full of enthusiasm for the classics, and recognizing in Erasmus an innovator, honoured him as "a saint," an "immortal." They went in pilgrimage to his place of abode, passing through towns infected with the plague in order to see this "priceless pearl," which deserved a "divine veneration." These youths, in their vanity, treated all the older theology as nonsense (*mauleseltheologen*). From this time the expressions "poet" and "poetry" were used only in reference to the Pagan authors, and became, therefore, epithets of contempt and indignation in the mouths of the adversaries of the "Reformation." One of the leaders of the new revolutionary school was Conrad Mutian, whom Dr. Janssen describes as follows:—

He was styled the "Consul of Antiquity," the "Upright Professor of Virtue," the "Father of Beatific Repose" (*Vater der glückseligen Ruhe*), a man for whom the life of Christ was but a collection of symbols, and communion but a sign of peace and concord. The Saviour (said he) is only that justice and joy which we carry in our hearts; the true Christ can neither be seen nor touched (p. 29).

Mutian therefore neither said Mass nor received Communion, to the great scandal of his colleagues, the Canons of Gotha. These heretical extremes, consequent on the study of Pagan literature, suggested doubts in the mind of Erasmus, when he had grown old, as to the utility of such reading (p. 33, n. 2). Contempt for the study of theology gave rise to all manner of excesses at the university of Erfurt and elsewhere. In 1510, the young "philosophers" of Erfurt laid waste the buildings of that university, its collection of diplomas and privileges, its library

* See "*Specilegium Autographorum illustrantium Rationem quæ intercessit Erasmo Roterodamo cum aulis et hominibus ævi sui*," &c., published by F. L. Schœnemann, 1804, No. 32.

and colleges, and the "burseries" where the young men dwelt. The students left Erfurt in a body.

After Mutian, Dr. Janssen brings on the scene another Humanist—the famous Reuchlin, already mentioned. He describes the conflict with Pirkheimer and the theologians of Cologne, who wanted to create a theology semi-metaphysical and semi-rational, without putting themselves in opposition to the dogmas of the Catholic Church. But the young "philosophers" turned these studies into an abuse, explaining things after their own fashion, and Mutian declared himself their ally.

The fourth personage described by Janssen is the so-called famous Ulrich von Hutten, remarkable, indeed, for his flattery of Albert of Brandenburg, Bishop of Mayence, for his profligacy, and for his warlike and revolutionary tastes; a "knight of the sad countenance," holding highest rank as a libeller, dreaming ever of the subversion of religion and society; greatly applauded, together with Mutian and Reuchlin, by the classic youth of Erfurt, and well-known in our days through his biography written by David Krauss.

The Bishop, Albert of Brandenburg, and his court, are now presented to us; his luxuriousness, his neglect of his clergy and of all administration of his diocese, his ambition, and his admiration for the "divine genius" of Erasmus. The latter, in his turn, styled the bishop the "brightest ornament of Germany" (*Unicum his temporibus nostræ Germaniæ ornamentum*, p. 61); whilst Robert Turner, an Englishman, calls the episcopal court at Mayence "the slave of the spirit of the age."

The scene thus opened, Martin Luther comes to the front.

In the following chapter, Dr. Janssen proves indisputably, as also does Herr Pastor in his work, "*Reunionsbestrebungen*," that the irregularities of the churchmen, the decline of art, the privileges granted by the sovereign Pontiffs to the secular princes, and other grave abuses, were not the principal cause of the religious revolution.

Certainly, had it been a time of more ardent piety, of stricter morals, of less laxity among the clergy, of greater discipline in convents, resistance to the Reformation, and to Luther's teaching especially, would have been much stronger, and the revolution would have been less successful. The scepticism of Erasmus, the profligacy of Hutten, the ambition of Bishop Albert, the frenzied passion for pagan studies, all helped to smooth the way for the revolutionary chariot. Besides, it was not by protesting against certain irregularities in the liturgy, or in the application of canon law; neither was it by protesting against the accumulation of church livings in one man's possession, or against simony, the "*litteræ exputatoriæ*," &c. &c., that Luther began the

revolution. The causes which brought it on were the insubordination and pride of the reformers in general, and the unhealthy excitability of Luther in particular.*

Long before his protestation against the manner of promulgating indulgences, the abuse of which was not uncommon, and which was but a secondary accident in the movement, Luther had manifested the fanaticism which clouded his judgment. From his youth he developed a peevish and suspicious temper, partly inherited from his parents—both of whom were of irritable and passionate disposition—and partly fostered by his education. He fed his mind on the classics, and remained a stranger to the real consolations of Christianity; scruples took possession of his soul, and he began to doubt the mercy of God, or the existence of a happy eternity. He became a languid sentimentalist, and sometimes wished for the death of his parents that he might be able to pray for the repose of their souls (p. 74-77). Then he began to have doubts about the meritoriousness of human actions and the freedom of the will. This doubt became the mainspring of his doctrine, and carried despair into his soul. He believed salvation to lie in faith, which, said he, was the only means of justification. Then, growing more and more rooted in his own opinions, he soon began to fancy himself an apostle, a second Paul (p. 80). He propounded these views in his sermons, before giving them to the public in writing. The theses relating to the character of Indulgences, which he caused to be fastened to the church doors at Wittenberg, was not his first protest against Catholic doctrine. In this pamphlet he, on the contrary, defended this particular doctrine against errors and abuse; and indeed, the setting up a few theses of a religious character for public discussion was neither an attack on the Church, nor contrary to the custom of the times (ii. p. 77, n. 2). Until now, too much importance has been attached to this secondary fact.

Luther developed these ideas concerning free will and justification gradually in his lectures, interspersing them with abuse of the Roman court. Vainly his friends counselled moderation. When Albert of Mayence strove to restrain him from some excesses, Luther threatened to divulge certain secrets of the bishop's, which have remained unknown (p. 209). Luther became daily more impetuous in his aggressions against Catholic doctrine. It was useless to represent to him that he should mistrust inspirations which made him even more irritable in temper and more audacious in his preaching. It was useless to remind him that the Spirit of the Lord dwells with the humble and peaceable. Luther answered with abuse. However, in the

* Compare Dacheux, "Geiler of Kaisersberg," p. 11.

year 1515 he advised his friends not to separate themselves from the Church. Even in 1519 he still seemed to think a compromise with Catholic doctrine possible. But this understanding could only come about on the impossible condition that Rome should accept the views preached at Wittenberg. Luther's attitude did not tend to conciliation; he retired in anger from a conversation introduced by Cardinal Cajetan having reference to the court at Rome.* Soon he invited the Elector of Saxony and Philip the Magnanimous (!), Landgrave of Hesse, to put themselves at the head of the Reformation, and to threaten with exile such of their subjects as would not declare themselves in favour of "Christ and the Gospel"—that is to say, justification by faith, and the needlessness of good works.

At the time of the coronation of Charles V., in 1520, no practical result had yet been produced by the opposition. Many men among the noblest and most learned thought these ideas of Luther quite ephemeral, or else they fancied that his opposition would bring about a salutary reform within the Church. Among these were Billicanus, Crotus, Rubianus, Witzel (who was always a Catholic at heart), Haner, Glareanus, and others: and also Willibald Pirkheimer, one of the emperor's most distinguished councillors, a man of aristocratic mind, but shrewd, devoted, pious and patriotic. His sister was Charitas Pirkheimer, the celebrated Abbess of the Convent of Poor Clares at Nuremberg.† The famous law councillor, Ulrich Zasius, at Freiburg; the painter, Albert Durer; the poet, Hans Sachs; the councillor, Christopher Furer the elder; and many other eminent men, who at Luther's first appearance had a kind of belief the movement might prove of real service to religion; but their illusions being dispelled, they embraced the opinion of Erasmus, that "the teaching of the Reformer led to the destruction of all true knowledge, and that Luther could hardly be said to hold Gospel truth." By degrees all the most eminent men of learning abandoned his cause. In England, Sir Thomas More, and Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, cast him off. In 1529, Melancthon still believed in the possibility of a reconciliation, talked of the opposition as a provisional measure, and declared that he would not leave the Church.

In 1539, there was a general belief in the sincere conversion of all the anti-Catholic princes.‡ The pride of the Wittenberg preacher aroused mistrust as to the purity of his intentions and the truth of his doctrine (p. 176). Luther had himself inveighed against

* Höfler, p. 34.

† See Binder's "Charitas Pirkheimer." Freiburg: Herder. 1873.

‡ Pastor, p. 172 *seq.*

the pride of certain religious teachers; but this is not the only instance where his doctrine was in contradiction with his life. Before 1417 he wrote to the Elector of Saxony: "It is the height of pride to consider oneself as the temple of Jesus Christ; it was only the Apostles who could glorify themselves in this manner." But since then, blinded by his passions, Luther had gone from one contradiction to another. First he regretted his "humility." "Far from being proud," said he, "as is declared by the unbelieving Pagans, I repent me of a too great humility." At the first sitting of the Diet of Worms he had sat silent and confused, and it was only at the instigation of his friends that at the second session he assumed a bolder front; though it is now denied that he uttered the words so often put in his mouth: "Here stand I (*Hier stehe ich*). May God help me. I cannot do otherwise. Amen" (p. 168).

His arrogant boldness, evident to all (p. 180), showed itself henceforth in his whole conduct, and in the excitability produced by any opposition to his views. In a letter written to Henry VIII. in 1522, he expresses his regret at having been so "modest" in respect to a tyrant (Charles V.) (p. 219).

At the beginning of his preaching he thought his own views as an innovator perfect; later on, he embraced the socialist and democratic doctrines of John Huss, whose exaggeration suited him; finally, seeing the disturbed state of all Germany, he sought the favour of sovereign princes. At first he reckoned on the Emperor as likely to help the Reformation; when Charles V. would not accept his views he called him a tyrant, and threatened the princes who remained loyal, especially George of Saxony, to whom he foretold the Emperor's deposition (p. 221).

He was full of contradiction. He complained at one time of the lack of instruction for the people; at another he declares that reading the Bible (in his own imperfect translation of it, with his own commentaries [p. 199]), should take the place of all other instruction. At one time he warned his friends not to commit any act of violence or iconoclasm; at another he promoted sedition and civil war, because "God suspends all authority which is opposed to the Gospel" (p. 222). Elsewhere he says that he "will have nought to do with the sword," for "Antichrist must be destroyed without hands" (*der Antichrist muss ohne Hand zerstört werden*) (p. 225).

His judgment of the Bible at various times was so contradictory that this alone stamped it visibly with the seal of error. At one time he recommended the Holy Scriptures as the book of books, before which all university instruction, and all the writings of the Fathers of the Church, should disappear. Elsewhere, however, he considers the Bible to resemble any other profane book, in

which each one may read and find that which suits his own way of thinking. He rejected many portions as apocryphal, and allowed others the liberty of differing from him. At another time he pretends to be the inspired of God, the chosen prophet, to whom alone the gift is given to understand the holy writings. He declares his belief that "the word he speaks is not his, but Christ's, and his mouth is the mouth of Him who giveth speech." He is to be judge of bishops and of angels too (pp. 223, 286, 287).

Writing to the Elector of Saxony, in 1522, he says: "Your Grace knows, or if you do not know, I now by this make known to you, that I did not receive the Gospel from the hands of men, but from Jesus Christ, our Lord. Therefore, I may well glorify myself to be and to sign myself, as I shall henceforth, a slave, (Knecht) of the Gospel" (p. 209).

These contradictions did not escape the observation of his contemporaries. Jerom Emser, Professor at the University of Erfurt, points out that the learned doctor sometimes complained that he had been condemned as a heretic without a sufficient hearing, and without being defeated; and at other times he declared that he would suffer no interference from men, "nor even from angels." "How," exclaimed Emser, "is it possible to come to an understanding with a man who will acknowledge no judge, either in heaven or on earth?"

These contradictions proceeded from the serious doubts which Luther had as to the validity and justice of preaching a doctrine contrary to the one which for centuries had been studied and accepted by learned men and great saints (p. 177). In these hours of scruple the old despair revived, and he was tempted to commit suicide.

The Emperor was entreated on all sides to take the initiative in convoking a General Council, some thinking that it would put a stop to many abuses that had crept into religion; others hoping that the ideas of the Reformers would predominate, and that an Imperial and Lutheran Church would be the result. These last, therefore, wished that the Council would sit in Germany.

We will here turn aside to consider the position of the Sovereign Pontiff, and whether it was possible for him to listen to these aspirations, more or less disinterested, for a General Council, that peace might be restored to Germany and the Church. The Pope was quite willing. Several well-intentioned prelates had already advised Leo X. to convoke a Council, but he died in 1522, leaving an exhausted treasury and debts. His successor, Hadrian VI., elected whilst absent in Spain, and without his name even having been mentioned as a presumptive successor to Leo X.,* ascended the Pontifical throne as by the direct guidance

* Höfler, p. 58.

of the Holy Ghost, under circumstances more painful and perplexing than any other Pope ever met with at his election. He found the States of the Church attacked by revolutionary forces; the Italian princes, whose territories had passed into the possession of the Papacy, putting forth ever-increasing claims; Sicily threatened by the Turks; the north of Italy ravaged by the war between the Emperor and the King of France; Germany undermined by heresy, and on the eve of apostacy; the Emperor more taken up with his possessions in Italy than with the war against the Turks; the exchequer exhausted to such an extent as to necessitate the mortgaging of Raphael's *chefs-d'œuvre*; himself a stranger to Rome, knowing neither the manners and customs of the people, nor the ways of the officials, nor the actual government of the Church, nor the Court of Cardinals. These last had assumed the government of the Papal States during the vacancy of the Roman See, a sovereign body of thirty-five persons.* He found the palace pillaged, and the city stricken with the plague; his personal safety threatened by French intrigue; enemies on every side, who looked upon the election of a native of Holland as a disgrace to Italy; whilst he himself was physically exhausted by a long journey.

The whole of Europe was more or less endangered by the Turkish policy of Francis I.† Ever since the failure of his endeavours to secure for himself the German Imperial diadem—endeavours which cost him millions of francs—the French King's hatred of the Empire became implacable. He thought to triumph over the Emperor by the help of the Pope; but as Hadrian did not enter into his projects, Francis fostered the schism,‡ and refused every overture of peace, impatient to take possession of Milan.§ French traditions were all in favour of increase in power and territory;|| Francis, therefore, would only favour the meeting of the council on the condition that it sat in France. Even the Emperor, as King of Spain especially, put a thousand difficulties in the way of the Holy See.¶ He tried to turn to his own account the capture of Rhodes by the Turks, and his efforts at absolutism forced the Pope to make all manner of concessions; he did not hesitate to make use of the basest bribery to compass his ends.** In the face of this gigantic opposition Hadrian sought only to be the Father of Christendom. During

* Höfler, pp. 85 and 154.

† Höfler, pp. 460, 479, 483, 507, 509.

‡ Höfler, pp. 136, 509.

§ Höfler, pp. 483, 503.

|| Höfler, p. 7; compare Poulet, "*Histoire interne de la Belgique*," p. 476. Louvain, 1879.

¶ For the way in which Charles responded to the favours of the Roman Pontiffs, see Gams, iii. 2, p. 153, &c.

** Höfler, pp. 462, 501.

the two years of his Pontificate he developed a superhuman activity, that he might make all the people of the earth feel the influence of his fatherly yearnings.

He was solicitous to ensure the material and spiritual interests, not only of Italy, Spain, and France, but also of Scotland, Hungary and Sweden, where Gustavus Vasa ascended the throne with his consent, given because the voice of the people had elected the new regent,* and because the latter declared that he longed to shed his blood in the service of the Catholic Church.

Hadrian's influence made itself felt even in Poland and India; but Germany held the first place in the heart of the indefatigable pontiff. The one only satisfaction granted him in a reign of incessant trouble, was the submission to the Church of the schismatic Patriarch of Constantinople. It was impossible, with all these pre-occupations, to convoke a Council; and then, too, all the cardinals were absent from Rome, driven away by the plague. Moreover, the German States had no intention to await the decrees of an Œcumenical Council. They wished to arrange matters in their own interest, and to decide beforehand the points relating to religion (p. 331); indeed, forestalling circumstances in general, and the decrees of Rome in particular, the princes of Saxony, Hesse, Brandenburg, Anhalt, and of many imperial cities, no longer tolerated the adherents of the old Catholic faith; hence arose the name of "Protestant" now given to these princes.†

It appears, however, that the Emperor had as yet no idea of a schism. Luther and Hutten were furious because he hesitated to begin hostilities against the Papacy. Tonstall, the English Ambassador, who was present at the Diet at Worms, wrote to Henry VIII. that Luther had promised the Emperor a force of 100,000 men if he would prepare an expedition against Rome (p. 160). We know the Emperor had other plans. He wished for a reconciliation, and Hadrian VI., whose policy was generally favourable to the Emperor, complained that his quarrels with the other potentates of Europe hindered him from undertaking a war against the Turks, whilst Henry VIII. was preparing for a campaign against them.‡

As to the siege of Rome by the Emperor's generalissimo, the versatile Constable of Bourbon, in the year 1527, we are ignorant to this day whether the Emperor had anything to do with it. The earliest biographer of Hadrian VI., Paul Giovio, considers it

* Theiner, "*La Suède et le St. Siège*," French trans. by Cohen, i. ch. iv. p. 164. "*Pièces Justificatives*," i. p. 399. Höfler, p. 405.

† Pastor, "*Reunionsbestrebungen*," p. 15.

‡ Höfler, p. 485.

to have been the well-merited chastisement of the Romans, who had scorned all spiritual remedies.*

The first advance in the direction of a religious war had been made from another point.

At first Luther appeared pretty well satisfied with the results of the Diet at Worms. He was pleased that he had retracted nothing.† Hutten believed the "cause of the Gospel already gained if the German nobility would only take up arms against the 'Roman plague,'" but Francis of Sickingen, a warrior knight of great renown, who had seemed willing to put himself at the head of the armed opposition, changed his mind at the time Luther was outlawed, and offered his services to the Emperor against William de la Mark and Francis I. Being defeated, he again changed his mind, and resolved to make war on his own account, always under the pretence, however, of serving the Emperor. He levied troops to "open the gate to the Word of God," and chose for his device, "Lord, Thy will be done." Protected by Albert, Bishop of Mayence, who awaited the victorious success of his arms to secularize his diocese; encouraged by Ulrich von Hutten, and other knights of the Empire, Sickingen opened the campaign at the very moment that Hadrian VI., the last German Pope, set foot on Roman territory, after a series of misadventures and a journey of one-hundred-and-sixty-nine days.‡

Sickingen entered the diocese of Treves with the design of seizing the Electoral throne for himself; he was defeated, and Treves was saved, but the neighbouring fields and villages were ravaged and burned. This was the first achievement of a war begun in the name of the "Pure Gospel!" Sickingen was finally deserted by his fellow-gospellers; he was treated as a brigand. The Princes of Treves, Hesse, and the Palatinate coalesced against him. Sickingen was mortally wounded at the siege of his Castle of Landstuhl, and died, after making his confession, at the very moment the Holy Viaticum was being brought to him.

With him expired the greatest representative of the chivalry of the Empire (*Reichsadel, Reichsritterschaft*). While he turned the Reform to his own uses, he still identified his own interests with those of the German nation. In fact, the Diet of Nuremberg, in 1522, was entirely taken up with the complaints of the nobles; the grievances of the peasants, clergy, and princes

* Höfler, p. 383.

† Dr. Janssen proves incontestably that the Emperor did not break his promise to Luther of granting him a safe conduct. The contrary has been asserted by some writers.

‡ Höfler, p. 188.

could hardly find a hearing. Did we know these last better, they would have completed the picture of the state of Germany at the beginning of the sixteenth century.

Meanwhile, the revolution against the clergy was still being preached. It had already resulted in the sacking of the University of Erfurt, mentioned before. The people understood the new system after its own fashion, and interpreted the aspirations to liberty (so called) as the justification of profligacy; they gave themselves up to luxury and vice. "Behold the fruits of your Gospel," wrote Bartholomew Usingen, the Augustinian, to his friend and former disciple, Martin Luther (pp. 206-291). Luther himself marvelled that there should be so little faith, so little charity among the new sect (p. 207). The people by degrees were beginning to believe that the violent destruction of sacred objects formed part of the new creed (p. 457), and this, in spite of Luther's express wish that he or some civil authority should be consulted before they pillaged in the name of God! (p. 217).

The Diet of Nuremberg, of 1522, called the "Diet of Grievances" (*Der Beschwerdereichstag*), had been principally taken up with discussions concerning the war against the Turks. Its deepest concern, however, was with the religious state of the country—the two questions were connected. Chieregato, the Papal Nuncio, protested against the indifference of several princes, in presence of the great perils which menaced both faith and the Empire, "which, till now, had been a model of piety." His words were vain. Louis, King of Hungary and Bohemia, the first Elector of the Empire, was ruined by his evil surroundings; the Count Palatine, the Elector Louis, was a man of no importance; the Elector of Saxony was as "immovable as a wall or a log." The time was approaching when the Electors would have to choose between the Emperor and the King of France. The bishops were silent.* Those of Salzburg, Freising, Augsburg, Ratisbon, and Passau, were upbraided by Hadrian. The States-deputies reiterated their demand that a Council should be held in a town of Germany. Yet wherefore? Would Luther have yielded to an assembly of theologians and princes belonging to the Empire? . . . An edict was published against all heretical writings, and the Electors were entreated to tolerate such books, only as were approved by the Church. This is all that was done! Some historians up to the present time have, therefore, considered the Diet of 1522 as a victory gained by Lutheranism. Two years later, the Diet of Nuremberg, of 1524, had no further result than the admixture of French politics with German business. The nomination of a King of the Romans, to the exclusion of the

* Höfler, pp. 278, 326.

throne of Austria, had been proposed by some members. According to certain manuscripts, Francis I. did not hesitate to offer himself for that high office (p. 321). But the real interests of the Empire were forgotten. Many princes saw in this a punishment from Heaven for a long-continued neglect of their duties, and they accused each other of being the cause of the evils and disasters under which the Empire laboured (p. 258, MS. letter). Even the war against the Turks was forgotten; and in spite of the many dangers, spiritual as well as temporal, the abuses did not diminish of those in power, whether churchmen or laymen, nor did their vices, luxury and indifference; indeed, after the success of the revolution, they became more grievous (p. 338.)* In vain did Hadrian labour to effect certain reforms; in vain did he preach peace and concord, and strive to make both governments understand that only by union between France and Germany could danger from the East be averted. Charles V. thought that the pacification of Europe could only be effected by an alliance of Germany, Rome and England against France. Hadrian reposed too much confidence in Cardinal Contarini, who represented the French party at the Roman court. In vain did the Speaker of the House of Commons in England strive to point out that the falseness of French politics would remain, in war as in peace, an obstacle to all right understanding (p. 309).

Finally, the Pope joined the alliance against France. The Constable de Bourbon, insulted by Francis I., swore homage and fealty to Henry VIII., holding forth a promise of the French crown (p. 310, from "Correspondence of Charles V.," edited by Bradford).

Francis I. incited Ulrich, Duke of Wurtemberg, to turn traitor and organize the peasant's revolt (p. 311, n. 5). This project succeeded too well; but Ulrich losing his own estates thereby, threw himself, later on, with manifold promises and open arms into the revolution of "his friends," the same over whom he had formerly tyrannized in a merciless fashion (I. 494; II. 467, 507). The peasants had suffered for some ten years from the modern aspect (*tournoir moderne*) given to law and justice. The introduction of Roman law into Germany had sown the first seeds of animosity to authority in the rural population (I. 492). It had lost in part its ancient autonomy, its independence, its political influence, and many rights of land-tenure. Its decay was very apparent, (II. 572), and Francis I. worked upon this bitter feeling against the Emperor to forward his own interests. The preaching of

* In reference to this chapter consult the instructions given by George of Saxony, edited by Höfler, from MSS. (p. 344, n. 1).

Luther's adherents tended to excite the people to revolt against certain rights legitimately acquired. In his chapter on "The Stirring up of the People by Preaching and the Press" (*Aufwieglung des Volkes durch Predigt und Presse*), Dr. Janssen describes how the Gospel-teachers spread abroad their demagogic views, their indifference to the sanctity of marriage and to the observance of Sunday (p. 380).

This revolt of the peasants has been attributed by some to the tyranny of the territorial lords. This may have been the case in some localities, but the principal causes must be sought elsewhere. Moreover, it was not only the peasants who rebelled; imperial cities fanned the flame (II. 479, n. 4; 513, n. 4); and the town-insurgents were more numerous than the peasants (p. 487); though in order to shield the magistrates from blame it was called the Peasant-War (*Bauernkrieg*). A sort of religious character was lent to the war; the churches and their treasures, the clergy and their dwellings, became the prey of the insurgents in the name of the "Gospel."

Ulrich of Wurtemberg, called "The Lost Prince," was one of the leaders (pp. 467, 470). He had levied several thousand soldiers, all marked with a white cross, in the French fashion. The circumstances of this war are well known. The army set forth, like the Crusaders of old, with the battle-cry, "God wills it;" their dream was of an "Evangelical" republic, with the Emperor for President (II. 445, 451). The movement soon spread to Wurtemberg and the territories of Baden and Tyrol. All the south and west of Germany was in flames. Our author describes in vivid language the principal incidents of the revolt, with all its horrors, sacrileges, &c. (pp. 477, 520). Alsace became the prey of iconoclasm and conflagration (p. 482). Each town and village had to furnish twenty-five per cent. of its population for enrolment, "in the name of Jesus Christ," in the brigand army.

Luther at last interfered, and published an "Exhortation to peace;" but this only served to add fuel to the fire, for whilst disapproving of the conduct of the rebels in pillaging and burning, he poured forth a torrent of abuse against the churchmen, high and low, against the Emperor and princes who would not embrace the cause of his "Gospel." Shortly afterwards, in the very middle of the campaign, Luther seemed to abandon entirely the "Gospel cause," as preached by the "peasants," and in the same passionate style that he had abused princes and ecclesiastics he now in a second pamphlet attacked the peasants, calling on the princes to annihilate them all. This, says Dr. Janssen, was not a contradiction, but a fit of passion, for when his first exhortation was published, the whole of the Black Forest, Alsace, &c. (p. 489), had risen in revolt. The war

soon spread to the north, to Bavaria, and along the Rhine. Hundreds of convents and castles were pillaged and then fired, the owners being often atrociously outraged. The altar vestments stolen from the churches were cut to pieces; the victims of their rapine were forced in their own houses to sit at table, uncovered, side by side with the brigands who robbed them. Fury had reached such a pitch that the agreements made with George, the noble Bishop of Spiers, and Philip of Baden, were disregarded, and the pillaging of their lands went on almost unchecked. Other princes of the Church had to accept the most humiliating conditions (p. 515). The war extended as far as Thuringia, carrying death and destruction everywhere. This was the people's answer to the preaching of certain ministers at Erfurt, who for many years had excited them to come to the assistance of the "Gospel" with their spades and their scythes. Luther now was persistent in stirring up the princes against the peasants, promising them heaven as a reward for exterminating the "robber hordes." But the princes dreaded his passionate energy, and he complained most bitterly that, notwithstanding his efforts for the Gospel, he set everyone against him. "They threaten me with death," said he; "but to spite them still more I will marry!" (p. 535, n. 4).

Although the peasants were defeated in several quarters, they always rallied for fresh efforts, until they were finally overcome in Franconia, June, 1528. 20,000 were killed in Alsace, and 10,000 were beheaded in Swabia. Altogether, about 150,000 perished in the last engagements (p. 561, n. 3). About a thousand castles and convents were pillaged and burned, hundreds of villages disappeared, and thousands of families were reduced to the most abject misery.

The desolation did not end here. The monopolies possessed by the large commercial companies, to the prejudice of the people, still continued to exist. The price of provisions and clothing rose higher as the wages of the labourer grew less (p. 571), and Luther continued to preach the unlimited power of princes over their subjects and over Church property. "The princes and the lords," concludes our author, "became the heirs of the revolution."

This is the frame in which Dr. Janssen has set the second picture of his "History of the German People from the end of the Middle Ages." Without discussing facts which speak for themselves, we will, to be brief, sum up in a few words our opinion of this work. It is a deep and impartial study of a period much written about but little understood. It is an attractive picture, the lines and colouring of which are not borrowed from the imagination, but taken from Nature, from facts, and from the character of the men forming the different studies. These men

are grouped, to show to the best advantage each man as an individual, and as a part of the whole. Many sources of information have been thoroughly sounded, and the results patiently, conscientiously, and truthfully worked out. The manuscripts studied by the author offer us, as we have seen, a vast collection of new and interesting details. The effect of these qualities of Dr. Janssen's work will be that every reader who has not the bias of preconceived opinions, will acknowledge, as did certain friends of Luther, that the manner of preaching of "this servant of God," the aid afforded him by the ambitious Bishop of Mayence, the "brazen" Francis of Sickingen, the cynical Ulrich von Hutten, &c., &c., all unite in persuading us that in the religious and social revolution of the sixteenth century, God manifested Himself as the avenger of sacrileges and outrages committed against His Church and against society. The admiration expressed by the author for the modesty and piety of certain learned men of either party, whom he praises for the pursuit of those studies which raise the soul and ennoble the heart, is an eloquent testimony to the author's own excellent characteristics.

We will now pass on to Herr Pastor's work, which describes the different attempts made during the reign of Charles V. to reconcile, by means of diets and theological conferences, and, lastly, by a General Council, the dissenting parties of the Empire.

The first efforts made by the Emperor, Charles V., to reconcile the discordant parties, was at the Diet of Augsburg, 1530. Several princes had already perceived that their material interest would not be advanced by an absolute pacification between the Catholics and Protestants. They feared they might be compelled to restore certain Church property which they had seized, and to forego their increased importance in their small States. They saw clearly that the Emperor would only reign over an Empire entirely Catholic. Melancthon, who represented the Landgrave, Philip of Hesse, was of a conciliatory disposition, but vacillating; he had not sufficient penetration to seize the matters in question in all their bearings. By his indecision and want of firmness he now, and again, later on, retarded the pacification sought by the Emperor. The Protestants felt confident that Charles would be forced to make favourable concessions to them, because of the imminent danger from the Turks, which would compel him to make an appeal to the assembly of princes for help to fit out an army. Therefore they wished the war question to be discussed after that of the religious dissensions, for on the decision respecting these latter would depend the assistance they would give in the campaign against the Infidel.

Business began then with discussion on the "Confession of Augsburg," drawn up by Melancthon, by order of John Frederic

of Saxony. He had, in framing it, aimed at steering clear of both the disputing parties, and this to such an extent that he omitted to express a distinct opinion on the question of Grace—really the chief question at issue. He maintained the independent jurisdiction of the Church against those who would place it under the secular power. He protested to Campeggio, the legate, that he had no intention of separating himself from the Church or from the authority of the Pope. Differing from Döllinger, Muther, and other historians, Herr Pastor has a certain confidence in the intentions and probity of Melancthon, who, from what the author has told us about him, was weak, vacillating, and without a full understanding of the questions at issue, rather than false or hypocritical. Herr Pastor certainly represents him in the truest light; for these features of Melancthon's character disclosed themselves in every circumstance in his correspondence, in his attitude with respect to Zwinglius, and in his intervention at Hagenau, Ratisbon, &c. This indecision and doubt filled his own soul with despair. In 1539, he declared himself weary of living, when his efforts at conciliation had met with so little success.

At Augsburg, the Princes generally were disposed for peace; but this suited neither Luther and his fanatic adherents, nor Francis I., who never ceased for one moment stirring up discord in Germany, prompting Calvin to sow disunion in every assembly called together by the Emperor to effect a reconciliation, and making every possible effort to prevent the meeting of a Council anywhere but in France. The consequence was, that suddenly every symptom of pacification disappeared from the Assembly. The Elector of Saxony, the Duke of Luneburg, and the Landgrave of Hesse, anticipated the desired reconciliation by taking their departure, the last named by secret flight. Such was the result of the first great effort made by Charles V. to procure peace within the Empire, and to prepare an armament against the common enemy, the Turk. "The discord of the German nation was greater than ever" (p. 60).

"The Proposed Council" is the title of Herr Pastor's second chapter. At Rome there was some hesitation in meeting the views of the Emperor and the German Princes for the calling of a Council. The Pope feared that, from the tension of men's minds, the old question of the superiority of the Council to the Pope might be revived, and that schism would ensue. After some deliberation, he seemed to accept the Emperor's plan. The representatives of the Holy See in Germany were in favour of it, but Francis I. schemed night and day to render it impossible. This time Henry VIII. sided with the King of France, which made the Pope fear an alliance of these two princes against the

Holy See and Germany. On the other hand, the Elector of Cologne, Herman von Wied, and the Landgrave of Hesse, appeared to seek a reconciliation with the Pope, if only they might be allowed to keep the Church property they had seized. Rome at last decided to call a Council; but the policy of Francis I. (the Eldest Son of the Church) prevailed, and, to the great detriment of the Church and the Empire, sixteen years passed away before the project was executed.

After the death of Hadrian VI. and of Clement VII., Paul III. did his utmost to convene a Council, but every delay found the Protestant princes stronger in their resistance. The leader of the opposition was John Frederic, Elector of Saxony, who found it profitable to fish in troubled waters. Finally, the princes refused outright to take part in the Council; they declared themselves orthodox, but said that what they had wished for at the Diet of Augsburg they could not accept now (p. 102).

Herr Pastor devotes the third chapter to the men who were called the "expectants"—the middle party—composed of those who once hoped for a satisfactory conclusion of the discussions, whether political or religious. We have already mentioned some eminent men who belonged to this party, and who returned to the Catholic Church when they found that their expectations—sometimes selfish ones—were not to be realized. This return to the Church was far from general. The rising generation was more drawn to the new ideas of independence than to the old doctrine. The sons of "expectant" princes went ahead of their fathers. The noble Duke George of Saxony belonged to the reconciliatory party, and the Catholics suffered a great loss at his death; for his successor immediately embraced the Lutheran tenets, and men belonging to the "middle party" were no longer tolerated in his duchy. Amongst others, Julius Pflug, the friend of Erasmus, left the country, and sought a field for his labours in the neighbourhood of the Bishop of Mayence, Cardinal Albert of Brandenburg, who, though not of irreproachable morals, belonged to those who desired a reconciliation. It was he who commissioned Frederic Nausea to write a work on the marriage of priests and on ecclesiastical jurisdiction, concerning which we know only what Herr Pastor has himself rescued from oblivion (p. 161). Our author has the merit of having thrown more light on, and given more importance to this "middle" party, to which Erasmus belonged. Luther detested these men. He hated moderation, fearing that through the efforts made by the moderate party the Council might yet be convoked. This he in no way desired, "because the heart of the people was still attached to the old faith" (pp. 107, 112-169). Luther complained, from 1524 to the end of his life, "of the contempt for the Gospel shown by the people

generally." At first, a great many declared themselves in favour of the new views, hoping for the reform of certain evil customs which had introduced themselves into religion, but, seeing the Church threatened with a general overthrow, they turned their back on the "Gospel preachers."

This is why the efforts made by Charles V. to conciliate the divers religious and social parties, by means of solemn discussions, described by Herr Pastor in the third chapter, remained fruitless. In vain were conferences held at Hagenau, then at Worms, followed by the famous Diet of Ratisbon (chapter v.). To this last, though disapproving of them all, the Sovereign Pontiff was compelled to send a representative. The self-seeking princes knew how to render useless every effort at mediation made by the Emperor—who, it must be admitted, encroached on the rights of a Council in calling before his tribunal the litigating parties in a religious suit. The Holy Father, in sending a representative, was no less indulgent and conciliating than were the Emperor and the Catholic princes, who were anxious to escape, at any price, from civil war. This time it was chiefly John Cauvin (Calvin), the representative of French political interests at Hagenau, Worms, and now at Ratisbon, who rendered abortive the project of reconciliation. Backed by the selfishness of many of the princes, French policy could not fail to add fresh fuel to the fire of discord which devoured the German Empire.

"Three things in particular," wrote the Bishop of Feltri to Cardinal Farnese, in 1540, "prevented the reconciliation and the return of the Protestants. Firstly, the fear of the greatness and power of the Emperor; secondly, the probability that the peace would compel them to contribute subsidies for an expedition against the Turks; thirdly, the apprehension that they would have to restore the Church property they had seized." Marino Giustiniano, the Venetian, speaking of the state of Germany, said the same (p. 219): "The princes make a cloak of Protestantism to cover their own selfish projects against the Emperor, and France shields them. . . . Through the King of France the Turks even are their allies. On the other side," said he, "the Dukes of Bavaria, and their brother, the Archbishop of Salzburg, are good Catholics, but they are jealous of the power of the Emperor, than which nothing is more hateful to them" (pp. 64, 170-267). This is why they "make use of every means to prevent the reconciliation between the Emperor and the other princes." At Ratisbon, the French Ambassador tried to gain over the Pope's legate, Moronius, to promise that under no circumstances should the Council assemble anywhere but in France.

The Diet of Ratisbon promised at the outset to be a success. A conciliatory document, called the "Interim," had led up to it.

The authors of this document have been brought to light by Herr Pastor's acumen. Still, in spite of expectations, it had no important result. And this although the Emperor had sworn that he would labour with all his might at a "Christian reform" even though a collision with the Pope should ensue (p. 256). Charles made concessions in respect to Church property much more advantageous to its actual possessors than they could ever have expected. It was all in vain. The stubborn opposition of the Elector of Saxony made every effort useless. The advance of the Turks obliged the Emperor at last to dissolve the assembly. His endeavours to secure peace had elicited the disapproval of some influential men, who saw that the discussion of theological questions without a Council was a laughing-stock to other nations, and exposed religion to the insults of the evil-minded (pp. 283, 306). And when Charles, still intent on reconciliation, sought to promote it by theological Conferences, the opposition was still more universal.

It was at this time also that the famous conversation between the Emperor and the Landgrave of Hesse took place at Spire, when the Landgrave adduced the most far-fetched reasons to prove to Charles that a Council could not possibly lead to the internal pacification of Germany. The princes, in fact, only talked of a Council so as to escape the direct influence of the Pope; what they really wanted was an assembly in which they could impose their own views on the Emperor. Another Venetian, Alois Mocenigo, writes in 1548, as his countryman, Marino Giustiniano, had written a few years before, that the generality of German princes were Lutherans, not from conviction, but from a spirit of independence and cupidity. Such as did not profess themselves Lutherans lived in fear of being compelled by force to abandon the old faith (p. 343). The Council, so often deferred, at last assembled at Trent, but its labours had little or no influence over the anti-Imperial spirit in Germany. The Protestant princes sought every pretext for absenting themselves. Useless as they were, the Conferences and theological assemblies continued to meet until peace was again expected to result from the Diet of Augsburg, in 1548. Here again, it was John Frederic, Elector of Saxony, a prisoner ever since the Emperor had taken up arms to dissolve the Protestant Confederation of Schmalkalden, who headed the opposition against reconciliation with the Emperor, "before seeing even the resolutions of the Council."

France, as usual, spared no endeavours to mar the understanding now existing between the Pope and the Emperor; and the policy of the Dukes of Bavaria, who professed to have no other wish than to embrace fully and entirely the Catholic and German

cause, had for special aim to throw difficulties in Charles's way, that he might find himself entangled in an inextricable mesh, and be forced to make all manner of concessions in their favour (p. 356)

The Emperor hesitated as to whether he should openly espouse the resolutions drawn up by the Council—those especially relating to Justification. He did not yet despair of restoring peace to Germany; he spared his adversaries, but would not yield a single point of Catholic doctrine, such as it is defined by the Councils; and though at Augsburg he yielded to the Protestants on the question of the marriage of priests, and Communion under both kinds, he granted this liberty only till the Council had pronounced on both matters. He was only building a bridge for his adversaries. It was the "Interim," of which people said:—"Der Interim hat den Schalk hinter ihm" (the Interim means mischief). This provisional peace, however, seemed likely to become permanent. Melancthon appeared to consent to it in a long epistle, afterwards famous (p. 374); the Catholics were beside themselves with joy. This satisfaction was anything but universal. Melancthon had to endure many reproaches on account of his epistle. He allowed himself to be persuaded to work in secret against the "Interim," which he called the Sphinx of Augsburg (p. 403). The Emperor, on his side, was again accused of having trespassed on the rights of a council.

The imprisoned Landgrave of Hesse, and the prelates present at the Diet, had appeared to give their adhesion to the Interim, yet the old animosity soon reappeared. Princes and theologians had recourse to endless discussions, first in one town, then in another, each perfectly fruitless as regards the civil pacification. Charles once more thought he had secured his aim, the Protestant princes having declared they would accept the decision of the Council; but John, Margrave of Brandenburg, Maurice of Saxony, and the "brutal Margrave," Albert of Brandenburg, were meanwhile busy weaving a plot to deliver Germany into the hands of the King of France (p. 424).

All these circumstances brought about the "Triumph of Discord" (*Der Sieg der Spaltung*)—as Herr Pastor entitles the last chapter of his "Efforts for Reunion" (*Reunionsbestrebungen*). Charles reposed too much confidence in his princes to have even dreamed of such horrible treachery on their part; Maurice of Saxony, in particular, had been loaded with favours by the Emperor. Meanwhile, Melancthon was manifesting the weakness and indecision of his character. The Council met again. France was not represented; the Elector of Saxony put forward all manner of pretexts to excuse his absence (p. 439). The Protestant princes grew bolder in wresting their subjects from Catholicism and loyalty to the Emperor.

Lastly, King Ferdinand, Charles's brother, succeeded in convoking another Diet, at Augsburg; the results were infinitesimal. He was forced to yield to the foes of the Empire, and to accept a provisional peace, by which he virtually gave up all hope of ever seeing Germany united under a Catholic sceptre. This was the only way left open to him by which he might attempt to organize an expedition against the Turks. Charles had also yielded. He had lost the aim of all his endeavours. Two hours after his abdication had been made public the news reached Augsburg. Three causes, says Herr Klopp, had obliged Ferdinand to recognize the religious secession. The threefold attack by the Turks, the French, and the Protestant princes of the Empire (p. 476). The two sovereigns, however, do not seem to have yet realised that reunion was henceforth impossible; for, as we have seen, there were endless contradictions and perplexities in their policy.

But, in truth, the unity of Germany was broken for ever. Nicholas Cusanus had foretold it a hundred years before:—"The princes seek to crush the Empire under foot. If they succeed, democracy will follow, and in its turn will crush them."

All the glory of the Middle Ages had passed away. The traditions of art and science had been broken off. In seeking light men had found darkness and revolution. Instead of reorganizing they had merely destroyed. All restoration was now impossible; the edifice had to be rebuilt. It remains to the present age to reverse the injustice of the past. In many respects, it seems to us that the dawn of an epoch of true renaissance hovers on the horizon: the renaissance of historic truth, of religious truth, of art and science worthy of Christian society.

Works such as those we have just noticed contribute greatly to such a revival. Dr. Janssen, by his sketch of the civilization of the fifteenth century; Herr Pastor, by his picture of the struggle between evil passions and the spirit of order and right administration, founded on the traditions and aspirations of the people at the beginning of the sixteenth century; the Abbé Dacheux, by his gloomier canvas of the human frailty and vice which prepared the ground for the religious struggle; Herr Höfler, by his picture, as perfect as it is bright, of two years of the life of a Pope who was a centre radiating light and blessing; but who dazzled and blinded those whom he meant to aid; the Abbé Lederer, by his study of one of the instruments used by God to lend a right aim to the aspirations of so many souls, priests and laymen, who were being misled as to the rights and principles of the Church by the circumstances of the times in which they lived. And how sad was the ending of it all! The Emperor abdicating, thwarted in every aim, and the world face to face with an unknown future!

Herr Pastor's future as an historian seems to promise well. He has drawn the sudden turns of fortune with such a firm hand that one would credit him with a maturity of years he has not reached. A clear judgment, and extensive memory, and an attractive style, are all evident in his work. It may be that he paints the character of his hero, Charles V., in colours somewhat too bright. Charles V. did not understand the true nature of the revolutionary movement in all its aspects. He realised the power of men's evil passions as little as did Melancthon; wishing to offend none he offended all, and disgusted with the world and with his party, he despaired of the future, as did also Luther and Melancthon. His deep religious principles prompted his submission to the Church and his abdication. This last act, if not the most noble, was the most straightforward act of his life.

The slight sketch of these important works given in this essay will suffice, it is hoped, to recommend, as we would wish warmly to recommend, them to the English public. It may not be amiss to state that they are very far indeed from being expensive books. Indeed, they are comparatively low-priced books. At the same time, Dr. Janssen's and Herr Pastor's volumes are beautifully got up, the Abbé Dacheux's is almost superb, and the type and printing is excellent in all. A translation into English of any one of these works would be a service to the spread of historic truth among the English reading public.

DR. P. ALBERDINGK THIJM.

ART. VI.—THE CONDITION OF THE CATHOLICS OF IRELAND ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO.

WHEN we look upon the Catholic Church in Ireland at the present day, and see her crowned with the richest blessings of a benign providence, it is not easy to realize to ourselves how lowly was her state throughout the whole of the last century. And yet it would not be well that that period of her sorrows and humiliation were too soon to be forgotten. It is not only that its gloom and shadows bring out in brighter relief before us the religious peace and sunshine which Ireland now enjoys, and that it serves to teach the children of St. Patrick, scattered as they are throughout the world, to love and to cherish the inheritance of Divine truth, for which their Fathers suffered so much, but it moreover imparts lessons of wisdom and consolation, and cheering hope to those brethren in the Faith who, in so many countries of Europe at the present day, are subjected to the same humiliations

and trials. They may learn from the history of Ireland's sufferings that their constancy and perseverance in defence of religion are sure to triumph, and that the persecutions they now endure for justice's sake will be rewarded at no distant day by the crown of victory.

As late as one hundred years ago, the Penal laws were in full force throughout the length and breadth of this kingdom. It was not that England had not long before laid aside the delusive hope that Ireland could be driven by the sword to embrace the tenets of the pretended Reformation ; but she continued nevertheless to heap afflictions on the Irish Catholics, and she ceased not to pursue them with relentless hatred, that thus she might at least impress the stigma of reproach upon their faith, and degrade the religion which she had failed to destroy.

The words in which the immortal Burke has described the vicious perfection of the Penal Laws cannot be repeated too often, nor should it be forgotten that he was himself witness of the operation of these laws, and that many of his dearest friends had experienced their full rigour. "It was a complete system," he says, "well digested and well composed in all its parts. It was a machine of wise and elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a feeble people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man." The memory of this code, Mr. Goldwin Smith adds, "will remain a reproach to human nature, and a terrible monument of the vileness into which nations may be led when their religion has been turned into hatred, and they have been taught to believe that the indulgence of the most malignant passions of man is an acceptable offering to God ; for, it was a code of degradation and proscription, not only religious and political, but social."

MacKnight, in his "Political Life of Burke," also declares that "the Penal Laws form a code which every tyrant might study, and find his knowledge of the surest means of producing human wretchedness extended. He would see at once a terrible engine made perfect with all the science of political mechanism, for those who, with devilish malignity, would reverse the end of government, and instead of improving the well-being of the community, deliberately set about the destruction of a race."

Professor Morley adds his testimony to the same effect :—

Protestants, he says, love to dwell upon the horrors of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, of the proscriptions of Philip the Second, and of the Inquisition. Let them turn candidly to the history of Ireland, from 1691 down to 1798, and they will perceive that the diabolical proscription of the Penal Laws, and the frenzied atrocities with which the Protestants suppressed the Catholic rising

at the close of the century, are absolutely unsurpassed in history. The Penal Code has often been transcribed. In a country where the toleration of Protestantism is constantly over-vaunted it can scarcely be transcribed too often.*

It would not be within the limits of this paper to set forth in detail the long series of enactments, which were sanctioned in successive Parliaments to oppress and to degrade the Irish Catholics.

It will suffice for us to briefly sketch some of the distinctive features of the Penal Code, and to glean from the official records and other authentic sources a few facts, which may serve to illustrate at the same time the bitterness of the persecution and the true Christian heroism of the sufferers.

The first effect of the Penal Laws was to exclude the Irish Catholics from every position of political influence or trust, and to debar them from all means of acquiring either knowledge or wealth. Without apostacy they could not aspire to any of the honourable professions, not to say to represent a constituency in Parliament, or to hold even the humblest post in the service of the State. In trade, they were subjected to innumerable disabilities, and in order to escape from more serious perils, were often obliged to submit to the most vexatious and illegal exactions at the hands of their Protestant competitors. A price was laid on the head of the Catholic schoolmaster as on that of the priest. The law of Habeas Corpus did not extend to Ireland. In the official discourses of the Viceroy, Catholics were pointed out as the enemy against whom all parties in the State were exhorted to combine. As late as the year 1745 the declaration was made by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, and was solemnly repeated by the Chief Justice from the King's Bench, that the laws of the kingdom "did not suppose any such person to exist as an Irish Papist."

The Protestant gentry, who held in their hands the whole administration of the laws, had no sympathy with the Catholic farmers, and being practically irresponsible, threw them into prison at will, or ground them down with the greatest tyranny, and subjected them to indescribable hardships. The tenant was allowed no security in his holding. It was provided by special statute that if at any time profits were more than one third of the actual amount of rent which he paid, any Protestant that so chose could without ceremony take possession of his farm. Should his industry have reclaimed some marshy tract, or cultivated the barren mountain, an enemy was sure to be at hand deeming it little less than a religious duty to deprive him of the fruits of his toil, and to drive him forth from his home unpitied and unrequited. Under

* Morley's "Burke," p. 101.

such a system the Catholic tenants were reduced to a state of the greatest misery. A writer, in 1766, speaks of them as "naked slaves, who labour without food, and live while they can without houses or covering, under the lash of merciless and relentless taskmasters." By a mockery of legislation, grass-lands were by Act of the Irish Parliament exempted from the payment of tithes. Thus the rich Protestant proprietors became practically freed from contributing to the support of their own clergy, and the small Catholic farmers were left to the tender mercies of the tithe-proctors, who, "with all the hands of all the harpies," plundered them to secure a rich maintenance for the alien ministers of an alien creed.

It is needless to say that the trade of the country was discouraged. It was the remark of Swift that the convenience of ports and harbours which nature bestowed so liberally on this kingdom was of no more use to our people than a beautiful prospect to a man shut up in a dungeon. If, whilst England was engaged at war with a Catholic state, any Irish Protestant suffered loss from the enemy's privateers, a tax was levied on the Catholics of the district in which he lived to restore to him the full amount of his loss. Should it happen that a Protestant was robbed, and were it supposed that the culprit was a Papist—and I need not say no very strict proofs were required—the loss was compensated at the expense of his Catholic neighbours. Mr. Bushe, in his place in Parliament in 1782, mentioned the following case:—A Protestant gentleman in the County of Kilkenny, from whom some property had been stolen, was compensated by a heavy tax thus levied on the Catholics of his district. Very soon after, however, the robber was discovered, and was found to be a Protestant. Nevertheless, no restitution was made to the Catholics for the injury done them. Mr. Bushe added that it was a rule with the magistrates, if the robber had been heard to speak with an Irish accent, to account this a sufficient proof of his being a Papist.

It was penal to harbour a priest, or to assist at mass. Nevertheless, a Catholic was liable at any moment to be summoned by the local magistrate to answer on oath in what place he had last heard mass, by whom the mass was celebrated, and whether there was any priest or Catholic schoolmaster concealed in the district. Should he refuse to answer these queries, he was subjected to fine and imprisonment. If a labourer refused to work on a Catholic holiday, he had to pay a fine, and in default of payment was punished by whipping. A heavy fine was imposed for burying in the old consecrated churchyards, or for taking part in pilgrimages, and other public acts of devotion; and magistrates were requested to demolish all crosses, pictures, and inscriptions

that were anywhere set up. A Catholic parent could not appoint a Catholic guardian for his children. Should the parents de cease before the child had attained his twenty-first year, a Protestant guardian was at once appointed by Government, and it became his duty to bring up the child in Protestant tenets.

Catholics had no vote for the representation in Parliament. They were excluded from the privileges of freemen; they had no voice in any corporate or civil appointments. They could not hold even the responsible post of attorney's clerk, or of night-watchman in any corporate town. By special rule, no Catholic was permitted to be present in the gallery of the House of Commons in Dublin. In the MS. Minute Book of the borough of Ennis there is an entry, setting forth that "the nest of boxes," and the brass mortars, and the scales of the Protestant apothecary of that town, were duly seized, and sold in penalty of his having associated to himself "one James Hickey, a known Papist, and one who refused to sign the Declaration and to take the oaths." The determination to crush out every Irish industry extended even to the humblest trades. From Folkestone and Aldborough petitions were presented to Government complaining that Irishmen were allowed to catch herrings at Waterford and Wexford, and to send them across the straits for sale. Other petitions were forwarded, praying that all fisheries might be prohibited on the Irish coasts, except in boats built and manned by Englishmen. In the Irish House of Commons a petition was presented by the coal-porters of Dublin, complaining that one Darby Ryan, a head coal-porter, employed several Papists in that trade.

No means were left untried to add to the numbers as well as to enhance the privileges of the Protestants in Ireland. In 1709, a numerous colony of Protestants, generally known as Palatines, was brought over from Germany to Ireland. Houses were built for them, farms were allotted them at rents of favour, leases were granted them, and a special subsidy was voted by Parliament to aid them in the purchase of stock for their farms. It was soon found by their patrons that these strangers were more troublesome than useful. The Irish House of Lords, in 1711, adopted a resolution lamenting that the nation should have incurred a load of debt "in bringing over numbers of useless and indigent Palatines." Nevertheless, they continued for three-quarters of a century to enjoy undisturbed their houses and lands. When, however, their leases expired, the Palatine colonists gradually disappeared, or became absorbed in the Catholic population. The Protestant Archbishop Synge estimated, in 1715, that no less than 50,000 Scotch families had settled in Ulster since the beginning of William the Third's reign. Everything worth having in the country passed

into their hands. Dr. Anthony Coyle, Bishop of Raphoe, writes to the Secretary of Propaganda, in the year 1786, that in his diocese the Catholics were reduced to about 40,000, and dwelt for the most part in the mountains. The heretics were almost equal in number, holding the rich valleys and the towns. "There is no city in the diocese," he adds; "and as for the cathedral, it is needless for me to speak of it, for, together with all the revenues of the See, it is in the hands of the pseudo-bishop."* In consequence of the colonies imported from Great Britain and the Continent, several towns, such as Belturbet, and Coleraine, and Middleton, continued for a long time exclusively Protestant. In Carrickfergus and its neighbourhood, about the middle of the century, there were only a few Catholics, but no priest. In the town and parish of Holywood there was but one solitary Catholic. He was a coachman in the service of a Protestant gentleman named Isaac; and when he drove his master through the town the inhabitants used to run to their doors to have a look at the Papist.

The conversion of Protestants to the Catholic faith was beset with the severest pains and penalties. The convert at once forfeited all the rights and privileges which he had hitherto enjoyed. He was, moreover, regarded as an enemy of the State, and punished as such; and the priest who was instrumental in his conversion became subject to the same penalties. At the Spring Assizes in Wexford, in 1748, Mr. George Williams was adjudged guilty "of being perverted from the Protestant to the Popish religion," and was sentenced to be "out of the king's protection; his lands and tenements, goods and chattels, to be forfeited to the king, and his body to remain at the king's pleasure."† Two years later, a priest, named John Hely, was indicted in Tipperary for "perverting a dying Protestant;" and as he did not appear for trial, he was, in usual form, presented as an outlaw by the grand jury, to be punished as "a tory, robber, and rapparee of the Popish religion, in arms, and on his keeping."‡ Nevertheless, many Protestants were led to embrace the truth. The Protestant primate, Boulter, in his letters to the government in England, bitterly lamented that "the descendants of many of

* *Catholici pro majori parte incolunt montes, et numeratis omnibus totius Dioecesis, non sunt plures quam quadraginta millia. Haeretici eundem fere numerum faciunt et planities et oppida, quae sunt tantum quinque, ut plurimum occupant. Nulla est civitas, etsi existat Cathedralis, ejus descriptio non est praesentis instituti, siquidem ea utitur Pseudo-Episcopus cum omnibus redditibus annexis.*—"Relatio," presented to the S. C. of Propaganda, in 1786.

† See *Gentleman's Magazine* for April, 1748.

‡ Irish Rec. Office, Presentments of Grand Juries, 1750.

Cromwell's officers here have gone off to Popery." And in 1747 we find renewed complaints from Galway, to the effect that "of late years several old Protestants, and the children of such, have been perverted to the Popish religion."*

A Protestant, who being married to a Catholic lady, failed within twelve months to make her a Protestant, forfeited his civil rights, and incurred all the risks and penalties of a reputed Papist. At the Limerick election in the year 1760, several voters were objected to on the ground that they had Popish wives; and in due course their votes were declared null. By another clause in the Act of Parliament any barrister, attorney, or solicitor, presuming to marry a Papist, became by the very fact disqualified from continuing his profession.† A Protestant lady possessed of, or heir to any real property, or who held personal property to the amount of £500, by marrying a Catholic, forfeited her whole property, which passed at once into the hands of the nearest Protestant relative. If in a Catholic family the eldest son declared himself a Protestant, he became entitled to the whole property; the father could no longer dispose of any portion of it, and all the claims of the other children were set aside. As Catholics could not hold land in fee, it sometimes happened that they purchased property under the name of some friendly Protestant on whose honour and integrity they thought it safe to rely. To punish this evasion of the law, an Act was passed annulling all such purchases; and as an encouragement to informers, it was decreed that whoever, not being himself a Papist, would make the discovery of such a purchase, the property so discovered should become his prize.

When the child of a mixed marriage was baptized by a priest, the Protestant parent became classified among the reputed Papists, and had to suffer all the penalties of such offenders. The father of Dr. Young, Bishop of Limerick, was a Protestant, married to a Catholic lady. The infant was baptized by a Catholic priest. Mr. Young was immediately thrown into prison, where he was detained for a considerable time; and he was, moreover, subjected to a heavy fine. One happy result followed from this punishment. Mr. Young came out of prison a Catholic; and his son in after years became one of the holiest bishops who adorned the Irish Church in those perilous times.

Catholics were most jealously excluded from the use of firearms. No Irish Catholic could be a gamekeeper, or hold the humblest post that was supposed to involve the possession or the use of firearms. He could not even be a private soldier in the army.

* Boulter's "Letters," ii. 12; Hardiman's "Galway," p. 188.

† 7th George II. chap. 5.

When Primate Boulter recommended the Government to make Ireland their recruiting ground for the army, he took care to add that none should be enrolled unless they produced certificates of being Protestants and the children of Protestants. In 1719, the Lieutenant-Colonel commanding in Limerick, wrote to the Castle that the officers had used every diligence to find out whether there were any Papists in the army, "that several had been committed prisoners upon suspicion, and, though no certain proofs could be obtained of their being Papists, they were turned out of the regiment." Again, in 1724, Colonel Fleming, writing from Galway, declared the report, that some of his soldiers had gone to Mass, to be "a notorious falsehood." He adds, that soon after his arrival in Galway, he had suspicions of one soldier, named Oliver Browne, "that he was a Papist," and finding it to be the case, "the day following he had him tried by a regimental court-martial, who ordered him to be three times whipped through the regiment, and then to be drummed out of the garrison, which was accordingly done."* In 1757 an order was issued from England to enlist soldiers in the North of Ireland, but instructions were, at the same time, given to the recruiting officers to "take care not to enlist Papists, or persons popishly affected." So, too, by letter of March 31, 1759, it was permitted to enlist recruits in any part of Ireland, but the clause was added, "provided that they be Protestants and were born of Protestant parents." About the year 1775 some Catholic Highlanders had been enrolled in the army, and the officers, anxious to secure their services, had put no questions to them as to their religion. The Holy See, being soon after interrogated whether it would be lawful for Irish Catholics to accept commissions in the army in the same tacit manner, the question was referred back to the Archbishop of Dublin for his opinion. He replied by letter of the 20th of August, 1777, that he considered it would be unlawful for them to do so, and he instanced that in the very last session of Parliament in Dublin, when some member of the Opposition taunted the Government with admitting Papists into the army, the Ministry affirmed that such a statement was quite contrary to fact, and that "anyone voluntarily assuming the soldier's uniform, by the very fact was to be considered a Protestant; for, by the special laws of the Kingdom, to wear that uniform was to renounce any sect the soldier may hitherto have belonged to, and to embrace the Protestant faith." To further illustrate the case, the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Carpenter, stated, that in the late war, a Catholic having enlisted in the hope of his religion being tolerated, found, to his cost, what a

* Irish Rec. Office, June 12, 1724.

mistake he had made. He took occasion, on peace being proclaimed, to go to Mass, but was at once thrown into prison and subjected to other severe penalties.* Towards the close of the century, when the armed Orangemen, in many parts of Ulster, plundered the Catholic farmers with impunity, the parishioners of one district resolved to be present for one Sunday at the Protestant service, thus to qualify themselves for the permission to hold arms. Accordingly they proceeded in a body to the Protestant church, and their wives accompanied them. The minister was beginning to address his thin and scattered congregation when, to his great surprise, a great tramp was heard, and the whole body of the parishioners entered. Some walked straight up to the communion table, and sat down there; others went to the baptismal font to sprinkle themselves with holy water; but most of them knelt down, took out their beads, and, in quite an audible manner, recited the Rosary. As late as the year 1792, permission was refused to Catholics to enter the army. It was only in the following year that the ranks were thrown open to them. So strict was the law which thus interdicted the use of arms to the Catholics, that even a Protestant servant of a Catholic master was not permitted to hold or use firearms.

The question was discussed with considerable warmth a few years ago, in the United States, what part was taken by the Irish Catholics in the War of Independence. From the above facts the answer to this question must be apparent. It is true that the Irish Parliament granted ten regiments, which formed the whole available military force of Ireland, and sent them to fight the battles of Great Britain in the United States. But these regiments were exclusively Protestant, and the Irish Catholics had no part in that expedition. For some years previous to 1777, a large number of Irish Catholics had sought a home in the United States. These emigrants were in the full vigour of manhood, and, no doubt, fought in all the battles of the War of Independence; but it is needless to say they were not to be found on the side of England, and I have no hesitation to accept as accurate Mr. Plowden's statement: "It is a fact beyond question, that most of the early successes in America were immediately owing to the vigorous exertions and prowess of the Irish emigrants who bore arms in that cause." (Vol. ii. p. 178.)

* Notum est quod in ultimo bello, miles Catholicus sub prae-
fatis conditionibus conscriptus, pace postea restituta, ad carcerem et ad alias
severissimas poenas condemnatus fuerit, propterea quod Missam audierit.
—From Dr. Carpenter's MSS. in Archiv. Dubliniensi.

Mr. Froude* has laid great stress on a memorial presented to Government by some Irish Catholic noblemen, in 1775, in which, after referring to a subscription towards the American war, which had been declined, they solieit permission to take arms against the rebels. These few noblemen, however, no more represented the sentiments of the Irish Catholics of those days, than did the few Catholic Peers of the present day, who, in the House of Lords, voted against the Compensation for Disturbance Bill a few months ago. There was one other penal enactment, so peculiar in its restriction, that it merits to be referred to. Catholics were allowed to have horses, but it was not permitted them to have any horse of greater value than £5, and a clause was added in the Statute, that no matter how valuable the horse of the Irish Catholic might be, a Protestant proffering five guineas in purchase was entitled to become the owner. In the deeds of sale and in the leases of the last century, many singular clauses are met with from time to time, such as the prohibition to sub-let to Papists, or to permit a Catholic place of worship on the property; but, perhaps, the most curious clause of all is that which required the tenant to keep "Protestant horses." This clause had a double effect: it ensured horses of higher value than £5 for the cultivation of the land, and it kept the tenant more and more at the landlord's mercy, for at any moment, by proffering the legal amount, these horses could be appropriated by the landlord or his agents. Some curious incidents are narrated in connection with this penal restriction. A gentleman of the County Meath, named MacGeoghegan, had had his carriage horses seized by some low Protestant neighbour. He did not lay aside his carriage, however, but trained a pair of Spanish oxen, and with them continued to drive his carriage as before. In Waterford, a Catholic merchant, who had realized a large fortune, excited the jealousy of some of the Protestant gentry by the splendour of his equipage, and his horses were accordingly seized on. He had his revenge. He trained four fine bulls, and whenever the Grand Jury met in Waterford, he drove his four-in-hand through the streets, the gentry flying before him in all directions.

A few Catholics continued to retain, in remote places, some portions of their family estates, but they found it necessary to court obscurity, for they knew too well that their hold on such property depended on its being hidden from the gaze of Irish Protestants. When Mr. Smith was in search of materials for

* Froude, "The English in Ireland," ii. 176. With his usual inaccuracy he states in the preceding page that "few or none (of the Irish Catholics) had as yet sought a Transatlantic home."

his "History of Kerry," and visited Glencara, a small estate belonging to the O'Connell family, so happily hidden in the Kerry mountains that it had escaped confiscation, he received a great deal of kindness from its proprietor; but the request was made to him that the family should be left unnoticed in his work. "We have peace and comfort here," said Mr. O'Connell, "we love the faith of our fathers, and amidst the seclusion of these glens we enjoy a respite from persecution. If you make mention of me or mine, the solitude of the sea-shore will no longer be our security, the Sassenagh will scale these mountains, and we shall be driven upon the world without house or home."

Mr. Lecky, in his "History of England in the Eighteenth Century," having at considerable length set forth the sufferings and disabilities of the Irish Catholics, which I have thus briefly sketched, concludes with the remarkable words:—

It would be difficult in the whole compass of history to find another instance in which such various and such powerful agencies concurred to degrade the character and to blast the prosperity of a nation.

And he adds the following glowing eulogy on the fidelity of the Irish people:—

They clung to their old faith with a constancy that never has been surpassed, during generations of the most galling persecution, at a time when every earthly motive urged them to abandon it, when all the attractions and influence of property and rank and professional eminence and education were arrayed against it— They voluntarily supported their priesthood with an unwearying zeal, when they themselves were sunk in the most abject poverty, when the agonies of starvation were continually before them. They had their reward. The legislator, abandoning the hopeless task of crushing a religion that was so cherished, contented himself with providing that those who held it should never rise to influence or wealth, and the Penal Laws were at last applied almost exclusively to this end.*

Throughout the whole period of persecution in Ireland, the succession of bishops and priests was never broken. As was to be expected, however, many were the sufferings of those devoted men whilst they endeavoured to minister to their flocks. It was enacted under William III. (7th and 9th William III. chap. 25) that all the Catholic archbishops, bishops, and other clergy should depart the kingdom under penalty of imprisonment and transportation; and did they at any time return to Ireland, they were to be considered guilty of high treason, and to suffer accordingly. In 1704 this Act was in part relaxed. A certain number of the parochial clergy, duly registered, were to be tolerated in each

* Lecky, "History," ii. 256, 386

county. A particular district was allotted to each one, but were he to exercise his spiritual duties except within that district he incurred all the former penalties. New difficulties, however, very soon awaited the privileged clergy thus registered. An edict was published commanding them to take the oath of abjuration; and as all, with scarcely an exception, refused to stain their conscience by such an oath, all alike were thenceforward subjected to the direst penalties of the law. At any moment they were liable to be arrested and thrown into prison, and sent into exile. The better to give effect to those enactments, the Irish Parliament in 1709 passed a resolution declaring that to inform against a priest was an honourable act, deserving the nation's gratitude. A reward was voted of £50 for the discovery of a bishop or vicar-general or other dignitary, and of £20 for the arrest of any other clergyman, secular or regular. Besides these Parliamentary grants, other rewards were offered from time to time by the grand juries; and as late as 1743 a proclamation was issued by the Privy Council in Dublin, offering for the conviction of a bishop or dignitary the sum of £150; for every priest, £50; and for the discovery of persons who, being in the possession of a certain amount of property, had nevertheless been guilty of entertaining, concealing, or relieving a priest, £200. Other Acts of Parliament offered annuities and large rewards to such of the clergy as might choose to apostatize. But neither bribes nor threats could sever the pastors from their flocks. With heroic courage the clergy braved every peril to break the bread of life to their faithful people. Except during short intervals of comparative peace, they were obliged to travel from district to district in disguise; and they joyfully endured the privations and humiliations and hardships to which they were every day exposed. Whilst they offered the Holy Sacrifice they wore a veil over the face, or the altar and sanctuary were screened by a curtain, so that the faithful could hear the voice without recognizing the celebrant. During the day they were clad in frieze like the peasantry, and they usually carried a wallet across the shoulders, the better to conceal their ministry. Thus they passed from cabin to cabin, dispensing blessings, instructing the young, and administering the sacraments; and they lived with the peasantry and partook of their humble fare, which was at all times heartily shared with them. Mr. Lecky does not fail to recognize the heroism thus displayed by our devoted clergy:—

Their conduct, he says, in many respects was very noble. The zeal with which they maintained the religious life of their flocks during the long period of persecution is beyond all praise. In the very dawn of the Reformation in Ireland, Spenser had contrasted the negligence of the "idle ministers" the creatures of a corrupt

patronage, who "having the livings of the country opened unto them, without pains and without peril, will neither for any love of God, nor for zeal for religion, nor for all the good they may do by winning souls to God, be drawn forth of their warm nests to look out into God's harvest," with the zeal of Papist priests, who "spare not to come out of Spain, from Rome, and from Rheims, by long toil and dangerous travelling hither, where they know peril of death awaiteth them, and no reward or riches is to be found, only to draw the people unto the Church of Rome." The same fervid zeal was displayed by the Catholic priesthood in the days of the Cromwellian persecution, and during all the long period of the penal laws.*

The Archbishop of Armagh, Dr. Bernard MacMahon, lived in disguise for many years at Ballymascannon, in the County of Louth, under the assumed name of Mr. Ennis. Writing to the Archbishop of Dublin on the 7th of November, 1741, he states that he had been of late obliged to fly from his usual place of refuge, on account of four magistrates being in search of him, armed with warrants for his arrest. Another of our primates, Dr. Michael O'Reilly, whose excellent catechism is still in use in some dioceses of Ulster, generally resided in the parish of Termonfeckin. A few years ago, when stopping for a short time in that neighbourhood, I was conducted by a reverend friend to visit the house in which the primate had lived. It is a small thatched cabin, and inside, under the thatch, there is a narrow loft, formed of the dried branches of trees, where at times he used to lie concealed, whilst the priest-catchers were in close pursuit. In the adjoining orchard a fine old apple tree is pointed out, under which, like St. Philip Neri on the Janiculum, he was wont to gather the little children around him to instruct them in the catechism. At a short distance from the hut, at a spot where the main road crosses a little stream, tradition tells that he remained bent under the arch, and up to his knees in the water, whilst a troop of military galloped along the road and scoured the country in search of him.

Dr. John M'Colgan was appointed to the See of Derry in 1752. When he entered on his episcopal charge, he lived in a white-washed cottage at Muff, in the County Donegal. Soon, however, the storm of persecution became more threatening, and he was compelled to take refuge in his native mountains of Carndonagh, in Inishowen. Here he remained for a few days concealed in the house of a Presbyterian farmer, who had often befriended him. One evening, as this man was engaged ploughing a field, which extended from his house to the river, a messenger came running towards him in breathless haste, announcing that a party in search

* Lecky, "History," ii. 282.

of the bishop was at hand. Without a moment's delay, the farmer unyoked the horses, and setting the bishop upon one, and accompanying him upon the other, never drew bridle till they reached the village of Leenankeel. Here the bishop found a boat, and got in safety to Fannett. They were only a short time gone when the pursuers arrived in Carndonagh. They reported that "they found the nest, indeed, but the bird was gone." Soon after, this good bishop, worn out by anxieties and fatigues, was summoned to his reward. Two priests sat by his bedside in his last moments; and one of them has recorded his dying words, spoken in the Irish language, which he knew and loved so well: "My soul to God and the Blessed Virgin." Dr. M'Colgan rests in peace in a lone churchyard in the parish of Culduff, where once stood a noble monastery, embosomed in the mountains, and in sight of the waves of the western ocean.

Some few months ago an English gentleman paid a passing visit at the house of the venerated Bishop of Kilmore. He was very much struck by the portraits of the bishop's predecessors which adorned the sitting-room, but could not conceal his surprise that the place of honour between two of these portraits was allotted to a Highland piper in full costume. Still greater, however, was his surprise when he learned from the lips of the bishop that that was the portrait of one of the most illustrious of his predecessors, who being a skilled musician, availed himself of such a disguise in order to visit and console his scattered flock.

Dr. James O'Gallagher, Bishop of Raphoe, when holding a visitation in the parish of Killygarvan, in the year 1734, partook of the hospitality of its parish priest, Father O'Hegarty, whose humble residence stood on the left bank of Lough Swilly, opposite the fair and fertile district of Fahan. It soon began to be whispered about that the bishop was in the neighbourhood, and without delay the priest-catchers were upon his track. One evening a note was handed him from a Protestant gentleman inviting him to dinner. Whilst he read the letter, the messenger said to him in Irish, "As you value your life, have nothing to say to that man," a hint of intended treachery which the bishop easily understood. That night Dr. O'Gallagher retired to rest at an early hour; but, as he could not sleep, he rose at midnight and resolved to depart. The good priest, however, would not listen to his doing so, and insisted on his retiring again to rest. "The way is dangerous and lonely," he said, "and it will be quite in time for you to leave at dawn of morning." The bishop tried again to take some rest, but sleep had fled from him, and after a short time he again rose, and long before the morning sun had lit up the cliffs of Bennagallah, Dr. O'Gallagher was on the

bridle road to Rathmullen. At sunrise, a troop of the military was seen hastening from Millford. They surrounded Father O'Hegarty's house, and soon the shout was heard from them, "Out with the Popish Bishop!" A local magistrate, named Buchanan, was their leader, and great was their rage and disappointment when Father O'Hegarty assured them that the bishop had been there, indeed, but had taken his departure. They should have some victim, however, for they did not wish it to be said that their nocturnal excursion from Millford had been made in vain. They accordingly seized the aged priest, and binding his hands behind his back, carried him off a prisoner. The news spread along the route, and the cry was echoed from hill to hill, that their loved pastor was being hurried off to prison. A crowd soon gathered, and showed their determination to set him free; but Buchanan, raising a pistol, shot him dead on the spot, and threw his lifeless body on the roadside. It is only a few years since a terrible fate befel the late Lord Leitrim. His driver received at the same time his death wound, and fell lifeless on the roadside. The name of that driver was Buchanan, and he is said to have been the last of the descendants of the magistrate who thus went in the pursuit of the Bishop of Raphoe, and murdered the loved parish priest of Ballygarvan in 1734. Dr. O'Gallagher sought for a time a refuge in one of the small islands of Lough Erne, and a few years later was translated to Kildare.

No less hardships and perils awaited the Catholic bishop in the rich plains of Leinster than amid the rugged hills of Donegal. The illustrious Dr. Doyle, whose name shines so brightly in the roll of the bishops of Kildare, has left the following sketch of the labours of Dr. O'Gallagher in this See:—

This Bishop was eminent in the most perilous times for his learning, piety, and zeal. He seldom had a residence, but went about like his Divine Master, doing good, preaching the Gospel, encouraging the faithful, and consoling the afflicted people. For some years previous to his death he resided for a part of each year in a small hut of mud walls, thatched with straw or rushes, near the Bog of Allen, to which he might fly when sought after by the myrmidons of the ruling faction. The remains of his cabin still exist on the road from Allen to Robertstown, on the right hand as you proceed. They form a sort of il-shapen mound or mounds, and are separated by a ditch from the highway, as it passes over a small eminence which looks down upon the vast moor or bog beneath.*

The immediate successor of Dr. O'Gallagher in the united Sees of Kildare and Leighlin was Dr. James O'Keeffe. He ruled these dioceses for thirty-six years, and throughout the greater part of

* Fitzpatrick, "Life of Dr. Doyle" (2nd Edition), i. 239.

his eventful episcopate was subjected to all the hardships and dangers of the era of persecution. The following brief MS. sketch of his life is from the pen of Dr. Doyle:—

At the time when he was called to the care of these dioceses, the persecution raged violently, yet his courage and his zeal sustained him. He visited every part of his extensive dioceses frequently, sojourning for a time at Kildare, again at Tullow, often at Dunleckney, and still oftener at the houses of his friends; for he had scarcely any income, and when money was given to him, he only retained it until he was met by some victim of distress. From his letters which I have perused, it may be collected that he was often in want of the most common necessities, yet he never complains. He preached the word of God incessantly, often in glens and bogs, for chapels in his time were few and wretched. In all things he bore the appearance of a man of God, and so gained upon the minds and the hearts of those with whom he conversed, whether they were of his own fold or of the strayed sheep, that his virtue stemmed, as it were, the torrent of persecution, and gave peace to his people in his days. Religion seemed to arise at his call from the grave in which she was buried, and the vineyard assigned to him changed from a state of desolation to comparative fruitfulness. God blessed his words and works, in both of which he was powerful. I cannot find that he made any will, unless to desire that his remains would be interred in the *graves*, a piece of ground adjoining the town, which in the time of persecution had been granted to the Catholics for the burial of their dead, their parish church and its cemetery having been appropriated to the use of the despoilers of the country. Here he desired that his remains should be laid amongst the poor for whom he had lived and with whom after death he desired to be associated. A faithful servant who had long attended him, attached to him more by love than by reward or gain, had secreted from his master for some time five pounds. He had rescued it from the hands of the poor for whom it was destined, and reserved it to purchase a coffin and a shroud for their Father when he would be borne to the tomb. These five pounds defrayed the funeral expenses of Bishop O'Keefe.

In the neighbouring diocese of Ferns Dr. Sweetman was arrested and thrown into Newgate, where he was detained for several months, in 1751. He was remarkable for his stature and manly bearing, and the only ground for his arrest was the whisper of some apostate that the worthy bishop was a foreign officer in disguise. The description of Newgate prison in those days, given from the Parliamentary Reports by Mr. Froude, will enable us to understand why it was that imprisonment in it was regarded with such horror in the last century.

The prisons, he says, were dens of infamy and extortion. Newgate meant a dungeon, starvation, and irons. The Sheriff Marshal

was allowed a separate gaol of his own, called the Black Dog. At both prisons he made a trade of vending liquors. Each prisoner consigned, though but for a night, to the Black Dog, was taxed two shillings for a treat, and if he refused, was beaten and stripped. The charge for a bed was a shilling a night. Each room was a mere closet; and in many of these closets were five beds. In each bed three, four, or five persons were set to sleep if the place was crowded, and two shillings were extorted from each . . . Newgate, when the House of Commons Committee visited it (in 1729) was found choking with prisoners. Wretched objects were lying naked on the ground, some dying, some dead of cold and hunger. Some had been four days without food of any kind. The Committee inquired what allowance of bread was made to the Crown prisoners, and found that the custom of allowing bread had for some time been discontinued. The stench among the naked starving felons was so intolerable that the Committee fled after a stay of half a minute.*

At the beginning of the century, the Bishop of Ossory, Dr. Daton, was an exile in France. His last will and testament now lies before me, dated the 11th of April, 1698. It begins with the words, "Whereas I am banished by order of the Government." He had nothing to dispose of but a few books and sacred vessels and vestments. These he wished to be distributed among the clergy of the diocese and the parishes of the City of Kilkenny, in case he should die in banishment; but he adds the words, "In case I should return back to this kingdom again, I intend that the aforesaid things should remain to my own use and disposition." For fifteen years he ate the bread of exile, till his death in 1713. Another Bishop of Ossory, Colman O'Shaughnessy, towards the middle of the century, was subjected to special persecution, and lived for the most part concealed in the parish of Gowran. The Grand Jury of Kilkenny made a Presentment, in 1744, praying the Government to take steps "for the arrest of Colman O'Shaughnessy, Titular Bishop of Ossory," on the grounds that he had been domestic chaplain of the Pretender, and had been appointed solely through his influence. Of another illustrious Bishop, Thomas de Burgo, who adorned the same See in times of comparative peace, the small thatched house in Maudlin Street remained standing till our own day. Even with the additions which had been made to it from time to time it sufficed of itself to attest the many difficulties which had beset the path of our clergy, who in those perilous days had laboured with a persevering devotedness, unsurpassed in the annals of any other country, to hand down to us the sacred deposit of Divine Truth.

If we turn to the ecclesiastical province of Tuam, we meet with the Bishop of Achonry, Dr. John Hart, who was appointed to

* Froude, "The English in Ireland," i. 592.

this See in the year 1735, and lived for a time tranquilly with his brother at the family house of Cloonamahon. This property had been purchased some time before, under the name of a friendly Protestant named Betteridge, who professed a great affection for Catholics. He proved, however, a false friend, and in a short time he appropriated to himself the house and property thus purchased in his name. The venerable bishop, driven from his family home, found a refuge in the neighbourhood with some families, who risked all that they possessed in thus sheltering him. The parishioners of Ballysodare still hold in veneration an aged ash, and tradition tells us that during the latter years of his episcopate it was under its wide-spreading branches that he used to offer up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. There is a popular legend connected with this prelate which may perhaps be mentioned in these pages. He had a great affection for the little singing-birds, liberating them whenever he could from their cages, and otherwise giving proof of care for them in a thousand ways. On the day of his interment the little songsters requited the kindness of their benefactor, and myriads of them perched on the churchyard trees and chirruped their most plaintive tunes.

Dr. Thaddeus O'Rorke was appointed to the See of Killalla, in 1707. He was the son of an Irish officer who had been distinguished for his valour in the Italian campaign, and had fallen in the battle of Luzzara. He himself had held the post of private chaplain to Prince Eugene, of Savoy, and this illustrious commander, who held him in the highest esteem, presented him with a gold cross and a ring set in diamonds, and obtained a letter from the Emperor Leopold, recommending the newly-consecrated bishop to his ally, the Queen of England. But those marks of imperial patronage could be of little avail to a Catholic bishop among his persecuted faithful flock. He was no sooner arrived in his diocese than the priest-hunters were on his track. He was compelled to fly from place to place, and to adopt various disguises. Under the assumed name of Fitzgerald he lay concealed for some years in Joyce-country. His letters to the clergy were invariably dated *ex loco refugii nostri*. In his latter years he sought an asylum with his relatives, the O'Conors, of Belanagar, and it was probably there that he rested in peace, in 1735.

It was also in the year 1707 that Ambrose MacDermot was appointed Bishop of Elphin. He was of ancient and illustrious ancestry, and had lived many years in Rome, holding important offices in the Order of St. Dominic. Every precaution was taken to conceal as far as possible his consecration and his homeward journey. Nevertheless, immediately on his arrival in London he was arrested and thrown into prison. When under examination Dr. MacDermot passed off as an Italian. The interpreter, who

happened to be an apostate, had known him in Rome, and at once recognized him, but having received some kindness from him in former times, did not betray him. After his trial an official of the Court informed him that the authorities were fully acquainted with all the details of his career, and that they had learned from their agents on the Continent the full particulars of his consecration and his appointment to an Irish See. He was sent back to prison, and it was only after an imprisonment of four months that, through the influence of the Venetian Ambassador, he was liberated on condition that he would quit the kingdom within six days. He sailed at once for Holland, but thence without delay took shipping for Cork, and, travelling about under the assumed name of De Witt, and in various disguises, ministered to his flock till his death in 1717.

In 1702 a memorial was presented to the Papal Nuncio, in Paris, on behalf of Dr. Comerford, Archbishop of Cashel. He had laboured on the Irish mission for more than twenty years in a country district where the charity of the poor was his only revenue. In consequence of the rewards now offered by Government for the arrest of archbishops and bishops, he had little doubt that even this scanty means of support would soon cease, for as he was the only archbishop then resident in Ireland, all the informers would be in pursuit of him, and he would have to retire to some solitary place where he might be wholly unknown. It is added in his praise that "neither chains, whose rigours he had already felt, nor the fear of living an outcast and a wanderer, nor the hope of finding a place of refuge abroad, nor even the terrors of death, with which he has been often menaced, could ever induce him to desert the flock committed to his care."

His successor in the See of Cashel, Dr. Christopher Butler, was the son of Walter Butler, of Kilcash, and was thus closely allied to the noble families of Ormond and Fingall. His abode was for the most part in the Galtee mountains, not far from his old family estates. The next prelate, Dr. James Butler, lived to a great old age, and died in 1774. Towards the close of his episcopate, he was permitted to dwell undisturbed in a humble thatched cabin, on the site now occupied by the archiepiscopal residence in Thurles.

In the Public Record Office, Dublin, I have met with ten official documents which relate to the imprisonment and banishment of Dr. Sleyne, Bishop of Cork and Cloyne. As these documents are unpublished, and abundantly prove that the exercise of spiritual authority was the only crime of which this venerable bishop was accused, whilst they at the same time throw considerable light on the whole procedure of the Government in Ireland against the Catholic clergy, it may not be out of place to refer to them somewhat in detail.

1. The first in this series of documents is a presentment from the grand jury of the City and County of Cork, dated 27th of July, 1702, complaining that John Sleyne, titular Bishop of Cork, had collated Rev. Richard Hornet to the parish of Youghal, and had excommunicated Dominic Gough, the priest already in that town, for not submitting to said collation; and further, that Peter Murrrough, titular vicar-general of the said bishop, still continued in the city, and exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction there.

2. Letter of Joshua Dawson, secretary at the Castle, to the Mayor of Cork, from Dublin Castle, 8th of August, 1702, conveying a warrant for the transportation to Portugal "of the titular Bishop of Cork, and a fryar, and also one Martin, a fryar, which will be brought from Limerick."

3. Memorial of Dr. Sleyne, addressed from prison to Count Wratislaw, Austrian Ambassador in London, and forwarded by Lord Rochester, Lord Lieutenant, from London, to the lords justices in Dublin, on 27th of October, 1702. This valuable paper, thus officially preserved, is of particular interest, and is as follows:—

Most excellent Sir,—

Your petitioner, John Baptista Sleyne, Bishop of Corke and Cloyne, eighty years old, and laden with infirmities and weaknesses, having been five years kept in close prison—viz., from the year 1698—most humbly shews that lately, at a general sessions held for the Queen in the City of Cork, the petitioner was convicted before the judges because he had not departed this kingdom with other dignitaries and regulars of the Church of Rome, then perpetually banished this kingdom under the penalty of perpetual banishment, or during life. Now, by the order of the said judges, it is decreed that after so long imprisonment and hardships, your petitioner shall be banished for ever (to some islands which he knows not) in this rigorous winter season, and in the time of war. Your afflicted petitioner believes that it is beside the intention and knowledge of her Majesty that such severity is put in execution, and hopes she will mercifully spare his old age and gray hairs, filled with infirmity and misery, seeing nothing now remains for him but a grave. If your excellency, out of your tender regard to God's cause and the Church, should interpose with her Majesty in this thing, and oppose this cruel sentence, it is in the power of her Majesty and her lieutenant to prefer the petitioner to spend the few days he has yet remaining in his native country, either in or out of prison; and if it should be necessary for his liberty, he would give security of the ablest men not to do anything to the prejudice of the publick. So your afflicted petitioner, lying under difficulty, most humbly prays, who will never leave off imploring the Divine goodness for the prosperity of your Excellency's soul and body.

4. Letter of Secretary Dawson to Mr. Whiting, Mayor of Cork, from Dublin Castle, 9th of January, 170 $\frac{3}{4}$:—

Sir,—Upon a presentment of the grand jury of the City of Corke for the transporting the titular Bishop of Corke, according to an Act of Parliament in that behalf, the lords justices signed a warrant requiring the mayor and sherriffs of Corke to cause the said titular bishop to be putt on board the first ship that should be bound from Corke to Portugall, which order I enclosed in my letter of the 8th of August last to the then Mayor of Corke, but no account having ever been sent up of the execution of that order, or any reasons being given why the said bishop was not transported, their Excellencies have commanded me to write up to you for an account of that matter, and upon receipt of your answer further directions will be sent downe to you therein; and in the mean time no further prosecution is to be had against the said bishop, which I signify to you by their Excellencies commands, and am, Sir,

Your most humble servant,

J. DAWSON.

5. Reply of John Whiting, Mayor of Cork, to the above, setting forth that on receipt of this letter he had communicated with his predecessor in the mayoralty, Alderman Dring, who stated that he had received the orders referred to, but could find no ship going to Portugal. As regards himself, he had met with the same difficulty, and though he had agreed with several ships to take the bishop on board, yet they all pretended to be "forced to sea unawares," so that the bishop is still "in as bad a condition to be transported as formerly."

6. Letter to Lord Rochester, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (in London), from the Council in Ireland, Dublin Castle, 19th of Jan., 170 $\frac{3}{4}$, that the bishop's stay in Ireland had been connived at by his late Majesty, upon the condition that he should not exercise any jurisdiction; the grand jury at Cork at last sessions had made presentment to the Chief Justice Pyne complaining that he exercised jurisdiction, and that he had not been transported to Portugal; and therefore the orders had been signed on the 8th of August last for carrying out his transportation, by putting him on board the first ship bound for Portugal.

7. Letter of Lord Rochester, dated Cockpitt, 30th of January, 170 $\frac{3}{4}$, to the Lords of the Council in Ireland :—

I had the opportunity yesterday to lay before the Queen at the Cabinet Council your lordship's letter of the 19th inst., relating to the titular Popish Bishop of Corke, and have received her Majesty's commands to send you directions that your own order of the 8th of August last for the transferring the said Popish bishop to Portugal be put in execution. You will therefore take care accordingly, and some particular directions must be given to the Mayor of Corke to be more diligent in the observing your orders, for that by his own

account to Mr. Dawson, it was taken notice of here, his reasons were very slender for not having done as he was directed.

8. Letter of Joshua Dawson, from Dublin Castle, 9th of Feb., 1703, to the Collector of Customs at Cork, to pay to the mayor of the city the necessary amount for shipping Dr. Sleyne to Portugal.

9. Letter of J. Dawson, on same date, to the Mayor of Cork, conveying the order of council "that you cause the said Popish bishop to be put on board the first ship that shall be bound from Corke to Portugal."

10. Letter of Rowland Davies, Dean of Ross, to Dr. Marmaduke Coghill, in Dublin, from Dawestown, 4th of October, 1703, and endorsed as referred to the "committee on the state of the nation." He had been asked to forward to the castle all the particulars regarding the stay of Dr. Sleyne at Cork; he had also received several complaints relative to the exercise of jurisdiction by the said titular bishop, but the bishop had been shipped for Portugal before anything could be done.

These official documents, hitherto unpublished, leave no doubt as to the lengthened imprisonment and banishment of this venerable prelate for the sole offence of exercising his episcopal authority.* He died at the Dominican Convent of Buon Successo, near Lisbon, in 1713, aged ninety years.

But it is time that we should take some instances from the sufferings of the parochial clergy. In October, 1712, when the proclamation ordering the laws against Popish priests, &c., to be put into force was published in Armagh, Walter Dawson, a cousin of the Secretary at the Castle, received intelligence that "a Popish Dean of Armagh" was concealed in the neighbourhood of the primatial city. He had him accordingly arrested without delay, and thrown into prison. The official correspondence in the Irish Record Office gives us full details regarding this most singular case. The captive dean was the Rev. Brian M^cQuirk, who proved to be a bed-ridden old man, in his ninetieth year, weak of mind, being now in a second childhood, and so poor that he depended entirely for his support on the charity of his neighbours. The brother of the captive wrote to the Government deprecating the inhumanity of this arrest, and urging that it could not fail to bring serious discredit upon the law. A few months later, Walter Dawson again addressed the authorities of the Castle, setting forth that in pursuance of the proclamation he had arrested the Popish titular Dean of Armagh, and had obtained witnesses against him, but that on the 13th of February, before the assizes had begun, his prisoner

* For the subsequent history of this venerable Bishop, see "*Spicilegium Ossoriense*," ii. 369.

had died in Armagh gaol; he adds a prayer that notwithstanding this mischance, he may not be deprived of the reward of £50, which he would have been entitled to on the dean's conviction.

A magistrate in Listowel, whose letter of August 13, 1711, was forwarded to the Government, gives a curious picture of the earnestness with which the Catholic clergy in the south laboured to promote piety among the people. A priest, he says, named Bourke, a native of Connaught, was preaching throughout various districts of Kerry. He went barefoot, bareheaded, with a staff in his hand, and he exhorted the people as he met them on the roads, or in the fields, to forsake their vices and lead a pious life. He had a catechism, which he read and explained to them in Irish; and at the end of his discourse he used to intone the "*Miserere*," and scourge himself with a discipline until the blood trickled down his back. The magistrate hearing that he was followed by multitudes, and was reputed by the people a worker of miracles, sent to arrest him. He escaped, however, and was now continuing the same course in Limerick, where at times as many as 2,000 or 3,000 persons assembled to receive his instructions. The magistrate adds that, as far as he was able to learn, this priest had no object in view except the promotion of piety.*

One of the most active of the priest-hunters was known by the name of Edward Terrel. In the year 1712, upon his information, two priests, named Patrick McCarthy and William Hennessey, were arrested at Cork, thrown into prison, convicted, and transported. In October the same year he presented a petition to the Castle, setting forth his own zeal for the Gospel and complaining of the remissness of the magistrates. Next month he accompanied the magistrates of Ferbane in search of priests through a very wild country to the house of Mr. John Coghlan, "in a most retired place, far distant from any high road"; they found plenty of books, but the priests had fled. Early in 1713 this unfortunate man's career was brought to a premature close. The Dublin newspapers of the 23rd of May, 1713, announced that "This day, Terrel, the famous priest-catcher, who was condemned this term for having several wives, was executed."

Among the official letters preserved at the Public Record Office, Dublin, there is one addressed by George Macartney, the Sovereign of Belfast, to the Secretary at the Castle, dated from Belfast, March 24, 170 $\frac{2}{3}$, and giving some interesting details relative to Dr. Phelim O'Hamill, who was the registered priest for the extensive districts of Belfast, Derryaghy and Drum. This priest had been ordained in 1677, by the martyred primate, Oliver Plunket,

* Letter of J. Julian to the Right Hon. the Lord of Kerry, in Irish Rec. Office.

and was now in his 80th year. A proclamation had been issued for his arrest, and as he was not conscious of any crime he wrote at once to the magistrate, stating that he was laid up with sickness, but was quite willing to put himself in the magistrate's hands, and would do so as soon as he was able to proceed to Belfast; "accordingly, he came on Monday last," writes Mr. Macartney, "but being then at Antrim upon the commission of array for the Militia, he stayed in this town till I came home, and hath this day surrendered himself to me. I have put him into our town gaol, and desire you would communicate this account to their Excellencies (the Lords Justices), where I intend to keep him till I know their further pleasure." He then adds that the behaviour of P. O'Hamill had been such since the Revolution, and he had during the disturbances shown such kindness to the Protestants, protecting their property from injury, that the leading Protestants of the country had come forward to offer bail and to solicit his release. "However," Mr. Macartney continues, "the proclamation being positive, and no discretionary power left in us, I would not bail him. Thank God, we are not under any great fears here; for upon this occasion I have made the constable return me a list of all the inhabitants within the town, and we have not amongst us within the town above seven Papists; and by the return made by the High Constable there is not above one hundred and fifty Papists in the whole barony. Favour me with an answer to this, with the Government's pleasure therein." This important letter bears the significant endorsement, conveying the substance of the Lords Justices' reply, "Let him continue for the present where he is."*

A few years later the Rev. James Hannat, P.P., of Kilclief, was arrested, thrown into prison, and, after two years' imprisonment, sentenced to transportation. This worthy priest had made for himself, in Ballynally, a place of concealment from the priest-hunters, but on one occasion, being closely pursued, he took refuge with a Protestant family of Kilclief, named Stockdale, who concealed him in their barn in a meal-ark. Tradition says that that barn was ever after blessed, and even its thatch was never harmed by the greatest storm. The following letters, addressed to the Secretary at the Castle, preserve authentic details of his imprisonment:—

Downe, Feb. 21, 1713²

Sir,—I formerly gave you an account that I sent to search for one James Hannat, a priest whom I had reason to believe exercises ecclesiastical jurisdiction in this diocese, and the most dangerous

* Public Record Office, Dublin. The letter has been published in full in Benn's "*History of Belfast*" (1877), p. 416.

man in all the country. I am now to acquaint you that he is taken ; and Major Norris and I have sent him to this gaol with our mitimus. The Major and I are desirous to know the sentiment of the Government how we are to have ourselves on this occasion ; and if it be bailable what bail we are to take. I must tell you that the Papists in this country are very much alarmed and disturbed at his being taken, and so exasperated at the man who took him, that I have been obliged to give him arms to defend his house from their insults. The Sub-Sheriff has been with me since the priest's confinement, and told me that he had clapped a new arrest upon him for marrying a couple of our church clandestinely, which crime I leave to the Government to consider whether it be bailable. I wait your directions, and am, &c.

HENRY MAXWELL.

Downpatrick, Nov. 3, 1714.

Sir,—Yours I received of the 23rd of October. There is none in the gaols of the county of Down under sentence of transportation, but one James Hannat, a Popish priest ; he has lain in gaol about fourteen months, and has been about half a year of that time under sentence of transportation. George Lambert, Esq., one of the Justices of the Peace for the said county, and I have used our endeavours to have him put off, and have had him several times at Portaferry, but could get no ship that would receive him. We shall use our utmost endeavours to get him transported as soon as possibly we can, &c.

ROBERT JONES, High Sheriff.

Father Hannat was in due time transported, but the vessel was shipwrecked on the Antrim coast, and he made his way back to labour with renewed zeal among his people. He held in after years the dignity of Archdeacon of Down. The informer who had betrayed him was hated by everyone. The wild justice of revenge even followed him after death, and his body would not be allowed to rest in any of the churchyards of Lecale.*

The Rev. Michael Plunket, at the beginning of the century, was P.P. of Ratoath, and Vicar General of the diocese of Meath. He had been for a time Secretary to the most Rev. Primate Oliver Plunket, and had spent many years in Rome. Being connected with some of the chief families in Meath, and being besides a man of solid piety and learning, several of the Protestant gentry sought, but in vain, to secure for him some toleration in the exercise of his sacred ministry. The chapel of Ratoath where he officiated was a wretched mud-wall thatched cabin, surrounded by other houses which screened it from public view. Even there, however, he was not secure, and whenever the agents of persecu-

*Laverty, "Diocese of Down and Connor," ii. appendix xlviii.

tion visited the neighbourhood, that poor chapel would be closed and the pastor would seek concealment in retired parts of the country. There was a priest-hunter named Thompson who singled out this zealous pastor, anticipating a rich reward for his arrest. Father Plunket, however, was effectively concealed in the house of a Protestant magistrate. A room on the second story was set aside for his use, with bed and fuel and provisions of every sort. The room was constantly kept locked, and it being supposed to be haunted, the servants never cared to enter it. Whenever Thompson applied for a warrant, this gentleman gave the priest timely information, and then he came at night with his servant, and drawing forth the ladder, which was left at hand for the purpose, he entered the room prepared for him. While the storm lasted, he remained there during the day, and if there were any sick to be attended, or any sacraments to be administered, the servant would apply the ladder at night, give the signal, and the pastor would descend, attend his people, and return before the break of day. In 1727, aged 75 years, he passed to his reward. His resting-place at the east end of the old church of Killelland is still held in reverence by the parishioners, and after the lapse of a century and a half, his memory is still cherished among the faithful as if they, and not their forefathers, had laid him in the tomb.

The memory of the Rev. John Barnewall, P.P., of Ardracree, is also held in benediction. He was a near relative of Lord Trimbleston, and his zeal and holiness added new lustre to the nobility which he inherited by birth. In the district which he attended there were two thatched mud-wall chapels in which he officiated; one at Neilstown, and the other in the valley beneath the old church of Rathboyna. It was only, however, during the lull of the storm that these could be used for the Holy Sacrifice; and while the tempest of persecution raged Mass had to be celebrated on the hills, or other hiding-places; and during the preceding week, word would be whispered round among the people where they would meet the priest on the following Sunday. On one occasion, a set of miscreants, anxious to secure the blood-money which was offered for the seizure of a priest, laid a plan for his capture. They met together in a Protestant house, and sent an unsuspecting messenger to call Father Barnewall to administer the last rites to a dying man. The messenger soon learned from the people where the priest could be found, and Father Barnewall hastened to discharge his duty. In the meantime many were the gibes uttered by the priest-catchers, and great was their rejoicing in the anticipation of their rich reward. A poor Catholic servant girl overheard them in their revelry, and contrived to meet Father Barnewall before he reached the house, and warned him of his danger.

On another occasion, he met face to face a notorious priest-hunter, named Pilot, but ingeniously eluded his questioning, and made his escape. He was clad in frieze, and had his blackthorn stick in his hand, and as he was proceeding to say Mass near Allenstown he carried his vestments in a small wallet across his shoulders. The priest-hunter was standing on the road speaking to a Protestant, who knew Father Barnewall well, but on this occasion pretended to be a stranger to him. When Father Barnewall came up, the priest-hunter, half suspecting his disguise, said, "Good morning, Sir." "Good morning," was answered. "My name is Pilot; what is yours?" "Your name (Pilate), Sir, bodes no good to a Christian," was Father Barnewall's reply. His friend now interposed, saying, "Let him pass, let him pass," implying that if it came to blows he was more than a match for his interrogator, and Father Barnewall safely pursued his way.

He had several other hair-breadth escapes, and it seemed almost a miracle that he was so long preserved to minister to his devoted parishioners. On one occasion he was so closely pursued that to ensure his safety a farmer had to build up a rick of turf around him. The martyr's crown, however, was to reward his life-long labour. He was now beyond eighty years old, and was in the discharge of his sacred ministry, when the agents of persecution seized him and led him off in triumph to Navan gaol. Thence, after a few days, he was sent a prisoner to Dublin, and he never more returned to his faithful, sorrowing people. Tradition says he was sentenced to transportation, but the ship being wrecked on the English coast, the mob who laid hold of him treated him with such indignity, that he expired in their hands.*

In Dublin, the clergy were repeatedly thrown into prison, and subjected to the greatest privations. In January, 1712, the Lord Chancellor addressed the mayor and aldermen of the city, urging upon them the duty of "preventing public Mass being said, contrary to law," and lamenting that the negligence of the corporation, for the past, had produced great disorder throughout the kingdom. Before the close of that year a few Poor Clares from Galway came to Dublin, at the request of the archbishop. They had scarcely arrived, when the agents of the Government surrounded the house, and obliged them to seek a shelter in the private houses of some friends. A proclamation was also issued for the arrest of Rev. John Burke (Provincial of the Franciscans), the archbishop, Most Rev. Dr. Byrne, and Rev. Dr. Nary, who

* For full details regarding this illustrious Confessor of the Faith, see Cogan, "Diocese of Meath," ii. 263.

were supposed to have been instrumental in introducing this community into the capital.

A few years later a swoop was made by the priest-hunters, and all the priests of the city were thrown into prison. Again, in 1744, on a Saturday morning in February, an alderman, named Aldrich, proceeded to St. Paul's chapel a little after ten o'clock, and finding a priest named Nicholas English in the act of saying Mass, he arrested him, allowing him time only to take off the sacred vestments, and sent him off to prison in a car. The alderman then proceeded to the chapel of the Dominicans, and sent to prison two of the fathers, whom he found there. The other priests at once changed their residence, except an aged Franciscan, named Michael Lynch, and he, too, was seized before evening and thrown into the same dungeon. De Burgo (*Hibernia* Domin. 175, 717), who has recorded this fact, adds that he was himself attached to St. Paul's Chapel, and had said Mass there at nine o'clock on that morning, and it was only a few days previous that he had changed hours with Father English. When Lord Viscount Taaffe was sent as ambassador from Vienna to London, he made an excursion to the land of his fathers. Being in Dublin on a Sunday, he went to Stephen Street Chapel to hear Mass, but found the doors nailed up by order of the Government. The doors of all the other chapels were nailed up in the same way. He wrote to the king, complaining of this vexatious proceeding.

Soon after a terrible event aroused public attention to the sad consequences of such oppressive legislation. It was only in the stables of the back lanes, or in the garrets of ruinous houses, that the people could assemble to hear Mass. On a Sunday morning, in 1745, a number of people were assisting at Mass in an upper story in one of the lanes of Dublin; Father Fitzgerald, a native of Meath, was the celebrant, and just as he had given the last blessing at the close of mass, the house tumbled down, the priest, and nine others, being killed on the spot, while several others subsequently died of the wounds which they received. An order of the Viceroy and Privy Council was soon afterwards published permitting chapels to be opened in the city, in retired places, for the use of Catholics.

Throughout the whole province of Leinster the laws against the clergy were, according to the whims or the bigotry of the local magistrates, rigorously enforced, and the sufferings of the priests from year to year are duly registered in the official papers of the Public Record Office. Thus in 1723 there is a letter of Carteret, the Lord Lieutenant, from London, addressed to the Lords Justices in Ireland, setting forth that an Augustinian friar, named Comin, "was lying for some months in Wexford gaol,"

and that he was under sentence of transportation, and suggesting that since the Spanish Ambassador had made intercession for him, he might be permitted to transport himself to Spain. From Kilkenny, Oliver Cramer, on Oct. 25, 1714, writes to the castle that one Martin Archer, a Popish priest, had been convicted of officiating without taking the oath of abjuration, and had been duly forwarded to Waterford for transportation. From Kildare, the Lords Justices receive intelligence on January 12, 1714, that several writs "against priests and schoolmasters" had been issued in the preceding year, but in vain, for all the culprits had fled, except a priest, named James Eustace, who had now been lying for several months in gaol, and who, whilst awaiting the order for transportation, was kept "in close confinement." So, too, in the County of Wicklow, in the summer of 1714, a priest, named M'Tee, was convicted of saying Mass, and sentenced to transportation. On June 4, 1714, the high sheriff of Wicklow gives an animated description of his labours on the preceding day to suppress the devotions of the Papists at the shrine of St. Kevin, in Glendalough. He had received intelligence that an assemblage of pious pilgrims was to be held at the seven churches there, and that persons from all parts of the kingdom would take part in the "riotous assembly." An armed body was accordingly got together, and several magistrates, accompanied by a great number of Protestants, rode all night, and met at the seven churches at four o'clock in the morning of the 3rd of June, the Saint's Feast. "On approach of our forces the rioters immediately dispersed. We pulled down their tents, threw down and demolished their superstitious crosses, filled up and destroyed their wells, and apprehended and committed one Toole, a Popish schoolmaster." Such was the glorious achievement of their martial cavalcade. The high sheriff adds: "The Protestant inhabitants of this county are unanimous in their inclinations and resolutions, and will exert themselves with all diligence and zeal for his Majesty's service in putting all the laws in every respect strictly in force against the Papists."*

A priest-catcher named Harrison was particularly active in the west of Ireland. A friar named Father Cunnan was officiating in the open fields, in the neighbourhood of Dooecastle, when the congregation was set upon by this Harrison and his band. There being no time to take off the sacred vestments, the poor friar struck off, habited as he was, to Cloonmore, to the house of a Protestant magistrate who had often befriended him. The magistrate, seeing that there was no time to be lost, told him to hide as best

* Letter of Thomas Ryves, to the Lords Justices, June 4, 1714; in Lecky, "History of England," ii. 274.

he could, and snatching the vestment put it on himself, and pretending to be himself the runaway, started off by the back door over hedges and fields, the priest-hunters being quickly in pursuit. At length they overtook him and brought him to town before the resident magistrate, who laughed heartily at finding the prisoner none other than his brother magistrate, who explained the matter by saying, "He wished to see how these fellows were able to run."

Father Nicholas Sheehy, P.P., of Clogheen, in the diocese of Waterford, was led to the scaffold at Clonmel, in 1766, under the accusation, indeed, of various crimes, but in reality through hatred of the Catholic church, of which he was a devoted minister. He had some time before been arrested and indicted for saying Mass and exercising the other duties of a priest, but for want of sufficient evidence had been acquitted. He was now accused of high treason, and a reward of £300 was offered by the Government for his arrest. Conscious of innocence he addressed a letter to the Government offering to place himself in their hands for trial on such a charge, on condition that his trial should not take place in Clonmel, where his enemies had sworn to take away his life, but in the Court of King's Bench, Dublin. This condition was accepted, and he was accordingly tried in Dublin, and honourably acquitted, the witnesses who were produced against him being persons of no credit, whose testimony no jury could receive. He was no sooner declared "Not guilty" than his enemies had him arrested on a new accusation. An informer named Bridge had disappeared, and was supposed to have been murdered, and Father Sheehy was now accused of having murdered him. It is difficult to free the Government from the suspicion of complicity with his accusers when they permitted this case to be sent for trial to Clonmel. There were none to accuse him but the same infamous witnesses whose testimony had been discredited in the King's Bench. Moreover, on the night of the supposed murder, Father Sheehy had been far away from the place assigned for the crime, with Mr. Keating, a gentleman of property and of unimpeached integrity. This gentleman no sooner appeared in Court to attest this fact, than a Protestant minister named Hewetson stood up, and accused him of a murder which had taken place in Newmarket. Mr. Keating was himself immediately arrested and hurried off to Kilkenny gaol. In due course he was tried and acquitted, there not being a shadow of evidence against him; but the enemies of Father Sheehy had gained their purpose, for in the meantime sentence had been passed against him, and he had suffered the last penalties of the law. By many Protestants of his own district Father Sheehy was held in the greatest esteem. His last place of refuge was in the house of a Protestant farmer named Griffiths, whose house adjoined the churchyard of Shandahan, where Father Sheehy's

remains now repose. During the daytime Father Sheehy used to lie concealed in a vault of the churchyard, and at night he entered the house, where a large fire had to be kindled, so benumbed was he from the hardships of what might justly be styled his living tomb.*

In 1798 some few priests took part with the insurgents, and paid with their lives the penalty of their offence. The hatred, however, of the Orange officers and men was directed against every priest. The illustrious Archbishop Murray was at that time curate in the town of Arklow. As he was one day passing through the streets to attend a sick-call, he overheard an officer telling his men to shoot the Popish priest, and it was only by turning instantly into a shop, and passing out at the rear, that he escaped death. He knew too well that these were not idle threats. A little while before, his saintly parish priest had been murdered by them in his bed, at the age of 78 years. On another occasion, when saying mass in his own mud-chapel, a body of troops, with artillery, were ordered to fire on the assembled congregation, but the terrified people fled in all directions, leaving the celebrant alone at the altar. The Bishop of Ferns, writing to Archbishop Troy on the 24th of June, 1799, states that one of his worthy parish priests, named Father Frank Kavanagh, had been treated most cruelly by a body of the Gorey yeomen. They came to his house and demanded drink and meat. When they had satiated themselves, they drew their swords, and abused him in the most contemptuous language, declaring that they would cut off the head of "the old croppy rebel scoundrel." Father Kavanagh made his escape, but they wreaked their vengeance on the curate and servants, on whom they inflicted severe wounds. This fury of the Orange yeomen was not confined to the living. It extended itself to the lifeless remains of the priests who were executed.

From another letter of the Bishop of Ferns to the Archbishop of Dublin, on Sept. 2, 1798, I learn that when the Rev. Philip Roche was hanged in Wexford, after death his body was thrown into the river; and the Rev. John Murphy, when sentence was passed upon him, was whipped, then hanged, and after death his head was cut off, and his body was publicly burnt in Tullow.

All through the dismal period of persecution, the Catholic clergy were not only exposed to the penal enactments of the laws, but they had further to endure all the privations and hardships consequent on the deepest poverty, and in this, too, it was their only ambition to partake of the bread of humiliation with their oppressed and impoverished flock. This extreme poverty extended far into

* For the terrible judgments that befel those who encompassed F. Sheehy's death, see R. R. Madden's "United Irishmen," vol. i. p. 84.

our own times. In the funeral discourse on the late venerable Dean Kenny, of Killaloe, whose labours in the sacred ministry extended over a period of 65 years, I read the following words:—"When Father Kenny was ordained, in 1814, there were few churches which were not the merest hovels, there were wide tracts of country without a church at all, and, with the exception of a few main lines of road, the country was traversed by the roughest bridle-paths. There were men living until within the last few years—there may be those still—who had seen the venerable priest, whom we have only known in positions of dignity, attending his sacred duties barefooted in his first curacy of Kilmihill."*

We may take another instance from the sketch which the illustrious Bishop of Kildare, Dr. Doyle, has given of Father Dowling, who was Vicar-General of the diocese, and for more than fifty years P.P. of Stradbally. He attended sick-calls in a cart without springs, his only cushion being a sheaf of straw. His habitation bore on it the same impress of poverty. When Dr. Doyle held his first visitation in Stradbally in 1819, this aged pastor was still living. The bishop arrived in the town late in the evening, and asked to be shown the residence of the parish priest. He was led to a tottering old house, little better than a ruin, in a remote room of which he found the venerable priest reading his office by the light of a solitary taper.

Time was when the earthen floor was daily worn by his wasted knees; but infirmities now bound him to a chair of unplanned wood. Dr. Doyle, with much humility, remained standing until Father Dowling had finished his office. He described himself as awe-stricken in presence of the saintly priest. At last the following dialogue ensued:—"I heard some one enter; what may be their will?" "A young man to ask your blessing, Father" . . . "My blessing is not worth much, if not worth while to give your name, but such as it is you have it freely." It was a touching spectacle to witness the emotion of the old priest in the explanation that followed, and the agony into which he was thrown, at finding himself unable to vacate the only chair his cell possessed, and offer it to his Bishop. He raised his withered hands to heaven, and fervently thanked heaven that he had lived to see Dr. Doyle.†

✠ PATRICK FRANCIS MORAN, *Bishop of Ossory.*

* "Panegyric of the Very Rev. John Kenny, Dean of Killaloe," by the Rev. John Egan (1879), p. 10.

† Fitzpatrick: "Life, Times, &c., of Dr. Doyle" (second edition), vol. ii. p. 523.

ART. VII.—SIMONICAL CASUISTRY IN THE
ESTABLISHED CHURCH.

- 1.—*Report of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Church Patronage ; together with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix.* 1874.
- 2.—*Report of the Royal Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Law and existing Practice as to the Sale, Exchange, and Resignation of Ecclesiastical Benefices. Minutes of Evidence and Appendix.* 1880.
- 3.—*Speech of E. A. LEATHAM, Esq., M.P., in moving his Resolution with regard to the Traffic in Livings, in the House of Commons, March 29, 1881.* London: EFFINGHAM WILSON, 1881.
- 4.—*The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England.* By Sir ROBERT PHILLIMORE, D.C.L., London: 1873.

COULD the disingenuous aggressor who drew down upon himself the crushing weight of the "Apologia," have anticipated for an instant the evasion, equivocation, deception, lying and perjury that Parliamentary Blue-Books would one day reveal in the Established Church, he would have been sobered into silence, if not into good sense, ere the evil spirit which possessed him should have wrung from him one syllable of the slanderous attack that, with wanton insolence, he made on the veracity of the Catholic priesthood and the integrity of its great defender.

Multitudes of Englishmen know little, and care less, about the traffic in Church livings. Aliens to the Establishment, with no territorial or pecuniary interest in its well-working, its scandals and abuses seem no concern of theirs and are a matter of complete indifference to them. Nay, they turn with impatience from the debates and leaders, and letters and paragraphs, and perhaps do not even notice the wonderful advertisements in the newspapers about them. Nevertheless, the question of Church Patronage bids fair to become, if not directly at least indirectly, one of the burning questions of the day. And, whether as a subordinate and inherent part of the more comprehensive and radical measure of disestablishment and disendowment, or as an independent matter calling for prompt and separate treatment, public attention will be drawn to it early this coming Session as it has not been drawn to it before.

The political tide has turned, and soon will be running high and strong. The weariness induced by the Irish Session of '81

has ebbed away, and the flow of activity has set in with a powerful current. The vague desires of Liberal constituencies for domestic reform have been falling into definite lines. The popular will is making itself felt. But though it may shape ministerial programmes, ministers and others in their turn shape it. And never before was there such an opportunity for the leaders of the people to awake them to a crying need for reform involving great principles, as that afforded by the publication of the Blue-Books which we are about to consider. All the details of what the best and most intelligent and powerful friends of the Establishment call not only a disgraceful and loathsome disease, but actually an incurable one,* are there brought together. The Select Committee of the House of Lords, and the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the law and existing practices relating to Church Patronage and what is familiarly known as traffic in livings, have brought them into the daylight. Large vested interests and narrow class interests can never again hide them from public view. There they lie, and will lie ready to hand equally for the parishioner and the parson, for the constituent and the member.

Undoubtedly questions affecting the spiritual interests of a nation do not as a rule easily address themselves to the popular apprehension, or touch the popular imagination. A question such as the Land question, on the other hand, wins a ready hearing amongst all classes; its bearings are obvious and patent to all; it concerns the material well-being of everyone; it is essentially a popular question—"terram autem dedit filiis hominum." But the interest of land grievances themselves becomes dwarfed beside that attaching to the scandals of patronage in the Established, once the National, Church of England. Scandals that, far from being merely the corruptions of a sound and useful principle capable of remedy without interference with the mutual and beneficial relations of Church and State, are so manifestly the legitimate and inevitable development of a bad system that the simple disclosures of them cannot be other than a deadly blow to the Establishment.

From the earliest days of its existence the Establishment has been the seat of the mortal disease of simony; a disease that has increased with its growth, thriven on its life, and fed on its decline. Civil and ecclesiastical enactments have been powerless against it. The laws of Edward VI., Elizabeth and Victoria have been as impotent to arrest its course as the Constitutions and Canons of the famous Synod of 1603, confirmed by the King's authority under the Great Seal of England. Simony

* "Times," March 31, 1881.

flourishes in spite of all of them. It could not be otherwise. Crown Patronage and lay Patronage are the inevitable accompaniments of an Established Church; and simony is the inevitable consequence of patronage; and perjury—we have it on the word of no less an authority than Lord Coke—is the inevitable result of simony. Now, the evidence of the Blue-Books before us, whilst it shows in an appalling degree the extent of simony, proves likewise, to the letter, the dictum of Lord Coke, “Simony is the more odious because it is ever accompanied with perjury.” It is simony long drawn out, but it is also the gamut of falsehood. From the low, trembling, uncertain sound of evasion it runs up the whole scale, through half-tones and quarter-tones—economy, equivocation, duplicity, prevarication, subterfuge, chicanery and lying, till it reaches the loud brazen note of perjury.

Simony, from apostolic times—*i.e.*, from the days of Simon Magus, its originator—down to our own, has always been held in the greatest abhorrence; a crime, in comparison with which, according to canon law, all other crimes sink into insignificance, *pro nihilo æstimanda sunt*. Lancelottus, the most concise and perspicuous of commentators, as Dr. Phillimore called him, defines it thus:—“*Simonia nihil aliud est quam studiosa voluntas sive cupiditas emendi vel vendendi spiritualia vel spiritualibus annexa.*” In another passage he says:—“*Contrahitur ergo simonia cum quis sacra quodammodo in commercium deducit.*” And elsewhere:—“*Simonia est dare pecuniam pro vicariatu vel alia administratione rerum spiritualium.*”*

In early times, the decrees of canon law were passed chiefly against the abuse of the *spiritualia*—*viz.*, the purchase and sale of holy orders. In later times they are occupied wholly with the *spiritualibus annexa*—that is, with simony in the collation and provision of benefices. But as Dr. Phillimore succinctly demonstrated, there has been no change of view as regards the notion attached to simony and the estimate of its enormity:—“The view of the ancients and moderns has been invariably the same, and that the former have principally inveighed against simony of the one description, the latter against simony of the other description, arises not from any different view taken by the Church as to the nature of the offence, but from the change of discipline which change of time and manners has rendered necessary.”† Again:—“Throughout the whole body of the canon law, whether we look to the text or to the commentators the prohibition is distinct and explicit,

* “Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England,” p. 1105, vol. ii.

† *Ib.* 1104.

and is unequivocally opposed to all traffic of any description concerning 'spiritualia, vel spiritualibus annexa.'** It is necessary to bear well in mind these words, "The prohibition is distinct and explicit." The importance of them will appear hereafter, in connection with what immediately follows—viz., that no fact can be better established than that the Church of England retained inviolate all the laws of the Catholic Church, inculcated by canonical jurists, against simony.†

The statutory enactments of Edward VI. and Elizabeth in their provisions "to avoid the detestable act of simony, because buying and selling of benefices is execrable before God," are equally plain with the ecclesiastical laws of the canonists. And in Canon 40 of the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical, decreed in 1603 by the Synod of London—a canon "universally binding on the clergy," excepting as regards the oath, and "deeply imbued with the soundest principles of the canon law on the subject of simony"—we have the clearest exposition of the discipline of the Church of England in the matter. For the sake of those unacquainted with it, we subjoin it, even at the risk of being tedious:—

To avoid the detestable sin of simony, because buying and selling of spiritual and ecclesiastical functions, offices, promotions, dignities, and livings is execrable before God, therefore the archbishop, and all and every bishop or bishops, or any other person or persons having authority to admit, institute, collate, instal, or to confirm the election of any archbishop, bishop, or other person or persons, to any spiritual or ecclesiastical function, dignity, promotion, title, office, jurisdiction, place, or benefice with cure or without cure, or to any ecclesiastical living whatsoever, shall before every such admission, institution, collation, installation or confirmation of election, respectively minister to every person hereafter to be admitted, instituted, collated, installed, or confirmed, in or to any archbishopric, bishopric, or other spiritual or ecclesiastical function, dignity, promotion, title, office, jurisdiction, place or benefice with cure or without cure, or in or to any ecclesiastical living whatsoever, this oath in manner and form following, the same to be taken by everyone whom it concerneth, in his own person, and not by a proctor:—

I, N.N., do swear, that I have made no simoniacal payment, contract, or promise, directly or indirectly, by myself, or by any other to my knowledge or with my consent, to any person or persons whatsoever, for or concerning the procuring and obtaining of this ecclesiastical dignity, place, preferment, office, or living [respectively and particularly naming the same, whereunto he is to be admitted, instituted, collated, installed, or confirmed], nor will at any time hereafter perform or satisfy any such

* "Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England," p. 1104, vol. ii.

† *Ib.* 1106-7.

*kind of payment, contract, or promise made by any other without my knowledge or consent. So help me God through Jesus Christ !**

And this oath, we are assured by one of the greatest living authorities on ecclesiastical law, whether interpreted by the plain tenour of it, or according to the language of former oaths, or the notion of the Catholic Church concerning simony, is against ALL promises whatsoever.† The declaration against simony of 1865, substituted for this oath by 28 and 29 Vict., c. 122, s. 2, and bound to be made by every person about to be instituted or collated to any benefice, in the presence of the archbishop or bishop, or his representative, by whom he is to be instituted or collated, in no way affects the law of simony as it has always been accepted. And the new canon contemporaneously passed by Convocation is precisely the same as Canon 40, already cited, with the exception of the substitution of the declaration for the oath. The declaration of the statute and the canon runs:—

I, A.B., solemnly declare, that I have not made, by myself or any other person on my behalf, any payment, contract, or promise of any kind whatsoever which to the best of my knowledge or belief is simoniacal, touching or concerning the obtaining the preferment of. . . . Nor will I at any time hereafter perform or satisfy, in whole or in part, any such kind of payment, contract, or promise made by any other without my knowledge or consent.

All this to the ordinary mind seems perfectly clear and free from ambiguity or subtlety of what kind soever. The declaration appears to be really as little susceptible of misinterpretation as the old oath it superseded, which, so long ago as 1780, the Bishop of Salisbury, in the historic Fytche case, declared to be “as clear as language can make it;” and incapable of causing a moment’s hesitation as to its “true meaning in the breast of any man who, in interpreting the terms in which it is expressed, followed nothing but the genuine suggestions of his own understanding.”‡ And though to a mind accustomed to revel in the play of legal subtleties the expression, “to the best of my knowledge and belief,” may appear to offer a loophole by which a disingenuous man could evade the intentions of the law, to the straightforward Englishman the terms of the declaration would appear to be framed with the direct purpose of guarding the well-known principle of law, that the provisions of an Act of Parliament shall not be evaded by shift or contrivance, by eliminating all possibility of such evasion. Yet if we are to believe learned members of Committees and Royal Commissioners, simony, in spite of the definitions of the canon law, and the

* “Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England,” pp. 1108–9, vol. ii.

† *Ib.*, 1109.

‡ Burn’s “Ecclesiastical Law,” p. 361, vol. iii.

enactments of statute law, is a confounding will-o'-the-wisp. It is perpetually haunting the rich pastures and flitting about the fertile meadow-lands of the Establishment, yet it ever eludes our grasp. It is visible, but impalpable. It is a term so ambiguous and misleading, that it is both a snare to tender and scrupulous consciences and a shelter for consciences of a less sensitive nature: a plea for invincible ignorance and an incitement to knavery. The bare mention of it begets a sort of mental myopia — worse, it induces positive moral blindness. The unfortunate man in need of a living utterly loses the faculty of interpreting the word in a natural straightforward way the moment he is confronted with it in the declaration. So that, confused and perplexed in judgment and reason, he either shuts his eyes, and hands his conscience over to the tender care and skilful manipulation of his lawyer, and lets an agent go “to market for him;” or, doubting his doubts away, buttons himself up tightly in the coat of secrecy and success, and boldly buys for himself: “*Populus vult decipi, decipiatur.*”

Practically, said the Bishop of Peterborough to Mr. Few—solicitor to the Bishop of London’s Fund, and a man of wide experience in Church matters—practically you have had considerable difficulty in getting clergymen to understand the stringent character of the late oath against simony, have you not?

Undoubtedly, even in the case of men of undoubted piety, and more particularly in the case of the oath, it is quite remarkable how dense they were in seeing what its tenour was; and I remember my father constantly dwelling on the same point, that he had to read it over to them; these were men of undoubted piety, and yet they could not see that what they desired to do was against the oath. Hence one’s objections to the oath. It is bad for the over-scrupulous man, to whom it is a snare; and the unscrupulous man swallows it wholesale.

And, *mutatis mutandis*, that applies to the declaration?

Yes, though men take a declaration with far less hesitation than they do an oath.

Have you not found that the minds even of pious men were confused between the moral offence and the legal offence?

Yes.

They would say, “I do not see anything wrong in this transaction morally; it is not Scriptural simony?”

Yes.

And the confusion between the moral offence and the legal offence is a snare to tender consciences, and a means of evasion to those who are not scrupulous?

Yes.

It is astounding that men in orders, men of integrity, men whose instinct and perceptions of right and wrong have pro-

fessedly been subjected to the strictest discipline and most careful cultivation, should so easily forget the simplest principles of ecclesiastical law, lose their perception of right and wrong, and become hopelessly involved in subtle distinctions between legal and moral offences.

Let us pass on.

Mr. Lee, an episcopal secretary of long standing, is of opinion that the law has been so clearly pronounced as to what is illegal that there would be no difficulty in defining it. A solicitor of twenty-five years' practice and more, and the legal adviser of several ecclesiastical organizations, expressed the strongest objection to the declaration, on the ground of its being a "legal oath or statutory declaration," and consequently incomprehensible to the clerical mind.

You think, questioned the Right Rev. Chairman of the Select Committee, it being a legal oath, persons not of a legal mind may not quite understand it?

Yes; such persons may be very much embarrassed, or else they may come to the conclusion, which I have often seen arrived at by clergymen, that the whole thing is an absurdity, and that they may get through the matter in the best way they can. That I know to be a *very common* state of mind.

Have you known instances of that kind?

Yes, there have been many instances in which I have been fortunate enough to stop proceedings of this kind, and there have been other cases in which I have not been so fortunate, but in which the proceedings have gone on in spite of every remonstrance.

Nevertheless, when this same witness is pressed as to the character of the clergymen who have applied to him to carry out transactions which he knew to be simoniacal, he is forced to confess that men of *good repute* and *character* who came to him apparently ignorant of the immoral and illegal—for it must be remembered that the clerical mind draws a notable distinction between the binding force of statutory enactments and ecclesiastical decrees—nature of their proposals, had, after he had gone into the matter and pointed out the fact that their proposals involved a breach of the law of simony, carried out the transaction through other instrumentality. And further, in order to show "the state of conscience which prevails upon the subject," he instances the case of a clergyman, likewise a patron, who was in treaty for the sale, not the purchase, of a living. When it was shown him that the purchasing clergyman would have a difficulty in taking the oath, his sole remark was, "That is, of course, his affair." But immediately after telling this, Mr. Bridges, with delicate consideration for clergymen so respectable *in the ordinary sense of the term* that they would be *thought incapable of doing*

anything dishonourable, clears them from all charge of guilt, because of the anomalous condition of the law upon the subject, which confuses their minds about it; "it is treated as an anomalous thing which may be dealt with in an anomalous way." There is no anomaly. The law is now as it was a century ago, "a question of conscience alone; but unhappily, the force of temptation in this, as in other instances of moral conduct, operates on minds not sufficiently tender to the impressions of duty; and leads to the fostering a secret wish that the imposition of the oath could be either dispensed with, or the terms in which it is framed be differently expounded from its obvious import. The surprise of an unexpected offer"—we are using the words of the episcopal judge in the Fytche case already alluded to—"of a valuable benefice; the oppression of poverty; the calls, perhaps, of a numerous family unprovided for; and the glitter of comparative affluence; all contribute to induce to the listening to any casuistry which can reconcile interest with duty."* And vain is the plea of anomaly to-day. There is no escape from the pitiless interrogation of the chairman. Brushing aside technical distinctions, and legal subtleties, and statutory offences, he meets his witness with the broad incontrovertible fact of *secrecy*.

There is no denying it, there is no eluding the fact of secrecy. A solicitor of standing like Mr. Bridges owns that when consulted on these matters "you hardly venture to put the thing down in writing in the first instance for fear you may commit, you do not know to what extent, the person who consults you." Secrecy is the first and last word in all these transactions. "Strictly private," "intensely secret and private," "strictest confidence," "strictest privacy," "involute secrecy," "absolute secrecy"—this is the alphabet of clerical agency. In a word, clerical agency is quite as much the craft of concealing facts as of ingeniously evading the law. "Strict privacy vital" is the motto of the clerical agent: "The strict safeguard of involute secrecy" is the captivating bait with which he allures the unfortunate owner of a clerical conscience into the unwholesome atmosphere of his gloomy den. Mr. Cox handed in publication after publication, list upon list, of such men. One, for example, contained 124 advowsons and next presentations for sale; another 297 benefices for exchange—and "exchange is a mere cloak for the worst transactions that the agents engage in"—or sale. And all these publications are marked "strictly private" or "confidential," or notify that "clients will distinctly understand that in every case the names and particulars of any property in this list must be

* Burn's "Ecclesiastical Law," p. 361, vol. iii.

considered as strictly confidential, and not under any circumstances divulged to any but those interested in the purchase;" or that "no benefice can be inspected or communication made with the vendor without an introduction, or instructions from Messrs. Stark;" and that "they would take this opportunity of reminding their clients of the absolute necessity that there exists, whenever a parish is visited, of the object of their visit being kept strictly private;" or that "Patrons desirous of effecting strictly private sales of church preferments are advised to communicate in strict confidence with Messrs. W. Emery Stark, who are enabled from their many years' practical experience, and extensive connexion in every county and diocese, to negotiate successfully and with the strictest privacy the sale of advowsons, presentations, &c.;" or that "the essential feature in the sale of church property is undoubtedly privacy, and this is undoubtedly frustrated if the matter is indiscriminately published about." We have before us the "Private Patron's Gazette" for last November, one of the publications of that purist in ecclesiastical traffic, Mr. Emery Stark: a most instructive work. On the outer cover itself we are stopped by the N.B.—"This Register is intended *solely* for the use of private patrons desirous of selling preferment, and Messrs. W. E. S. trust to the honour of all parties to keep it strictly private, and to treat all particulars given here with implicit confidence." And, returning to our Blue-Books, we find a letter from the same reputable agent, offering for sale the Rectory of Tollard-Royal. Under the superscription, "Private," we read:—

We would call your attention to the following properties in the "Church Preferment Register." We give you the names in the strictest confidence, and will send full details if suitable.

F. 3,450. Tollard Rectory, near Shaftesbury. Immediate possession. Price asked £8,000, but we would submit any fair offer. . . .

The grave moral declension involved in—begetting it and begotten of it—this secrecy lies plainly before us. Mr. Leatham, the member for Huddersfield, who, more than any other man, has striven to put an end to the scandals of patronage and to induce the Government to deal with the matter effectually, and not to leave it to the inadequate treatment of private members, tells us that Mr. Stark is one of those agents to whom patrons and clergymen betake themselves who are anxious to carry out the exchange, or—to put aside euphemism and speak plain English—the sale and purchase of livings with the minimum of illegality. Questioned by the Duke of Cleveland as to the extent of the contravention of the existing law of simony, Mr. Stark said:—

The Commissioners are well aware that the sale of advowsons, with the understanding that possession is to be given, is, according to the law, illegal. Three-fourths of the patrons with whom I have come in contact, and among them clergymen of the highest standing, do not recognize any moral crime in an infraction of the present law of simony, and the consequence is that they freely and unhesitatingly sell and purchase advowsons with the understanding that immediate possession is to be given, not looking upon it as any sin. When I say clergymen of high standing, I have had business with ex-colonial bishops, canons, and other dignitaries of the Church who, of course, would be above suspicion in every way. . . . Three-fourths of my transactions are with immediate possession, and, strictly speaking, they are nearly all illegal.

The Bishop of Peterborough: You say that the clergymen to whom you refer, who offer their benefices for sale, with immediate possession, regard the transaction as in no way sinful; they know it nevertheless to be illegal?—Most decidedly.

Knowing it to be illegal, these clerical patrons ask you to help them to break the law?—Decidedly: and the matter is completed by solicitors of the highest standing in the country. The clerical agent simply introduces the parties. The lawyers draw up the necessary deeds.

You are, of course, aware that a simoniacal transaction in obtaining possession of a benefice voids the benefice?—Decidedly.

These clerical patrons are aware that if these transactions became public, and anyone took proceedings upon them, their benefices would be void?—No doubt.

Is that one of the reasons why strict secrecy and confidence is so largely insisted on?—Secrecy must necessarily be insisted on, the transaction being an illegal transaction, and the punishment being very severe.

Being engaged in an illegal transaction, knowing it to be illegal, and being determined to break the law for their own interest, these clerical patrons naturally wish these matters to be kept as private as possible?—That, of course, is the reason for secrecy; the centre point of simony is the immediate possession.

And here we would observe that Mr. Stark has no doubt about what constitutes simony. It is quite apparent to his mind, as well as that the principle of the law is a right and proper one. Yet, a little while after, when urged on the same point in face of the property part of the question, even he grows confused. He thinks of his clients, debarred by a hard inexorable law from temporal good merely for the sake of a spiritual one, and pity dims his sight.

Church property is so mixed up with the rights of property, that it is difficult to distinguish between rights of property and questions of conscience. And my feeling (he continues) is in favour of a relaxation of the present law; in fact, it seems to me that nothing

could be more strict than the present law of simony with all its penalties. What greater punishment can be inflicted upon a clergyman than to deprive him of his benefice and also of his status?—and yet these laws are systematically evaded by clergymen of the highest character, by colonial bishops, and clergymen of the very highest position, who do not recognize any moral wrong in doing so!

The Bishop, seeing his confusion, fastens on his last words, draws him, though reluctant, back to his original standpoint, and, with relentless irony, holds him to it.

That is to say, there are clergymen of the highest character who do not recognize any moral wrong in breaking the laws of their country?—You may put it in that way. *The law is clear and distinct.* Only this morning, in an interview I had with one of my clients, I pointed out to him that it was an illegal transaction. In all my transactions with my clients, I have always stated that they are illegal transactions. . . .

Notwithstanding that, these pious and good clergymen deliberately break the law?—Yes; men of the highest standing.

It certainly seems that the Right Rev. Prelate was none too severe when he compared these high dignitaries and eminently pious clergymen to the common poacher, who (in the exercise of private judgment) breaks the law because he holds the law to be very unfair. The Rev. G. Venables, however, interposed with the compassionate suggestion, that in point of fact such clergymen say that the transaction is not simoniacal, and at once enabled Mr. Stark to fall back upon the old excuse that “that word simony is a misnomer and misleading, and ought to be no longer used.” But, meanwhile, Archdeacon Palmer remembered the awkward matter of secrecy:—

We may take it as a fact that, as a rule, the persons who deal with you in these matters desire privacy?—Yes.

Then may we take it as your view that their reason for desiring privacy is that they expect to be involved in illegal transactions; that they contemplate the probability of having to break the law?—On the part of the vendor and purchaser undoubtedly that is so.

Not that they have any feeling against sale and purchase within the limits of the law?—No, their object is to get an advowson with immediate possession, and they know that they are contravening the law, and they ask the transaction to be kept private; that is the reason for privacy.

Mr. Jeune: The matter is carried out by the lawyers afterwards?—Yes; my work is simply the introduction of the parties and the arrangement of the price.

I do not understand you to say that when the matter gets into the lawyer's hands there is any agreement actually made that there shall be a resignation?—I suppose that there is a pretty general understanding between the parties that that is to be the case.

Duke of Cleveland : It cannot be an agreement drawn up in a written document ?—No.

Mr. Jeune : There is a sort of understanding not put into writing, and not binding in law on either side, that there shall be a resignation ?—Yes, not a legal document.

It comes to this : there may be a breaking of the spirit of the law, but there is no violation of the letter of the law ?—That is rather a difficult question for me to answer ; that is a question for the Commissioners to decide.

All this seems a very fair sample of casuistry—to call it nothing worse. We continue :—

The Duke of Cleveland : There is nothing illegal patent in the transaction ?—No.

The illegality is concealed ?—It is a matter of honour between the two clergymen.

Archdeacon Palmer : Consequently, if these deeds were registered or advertised in the *Gazette* no breach of the law would appear upon the face of them ?—No.

Rev. G. Venables : How do you enforce completion of the agreement ?—You could not enforce it legally.

Have you ever known cases in which the agreement has not been carried out ?—Very few. The difficulty of the present law is that if you get into the hands of unscrupulous men you are at their mercy ; that is one reason why I would repeal the law of simony.

The unscrupulous men, it is to be observed, are not the men who draw these fine distinctions, but those who having broken the law, basely refuse to be bound by an illicit contract.

The Bishop of Peterborough : Would you repeal the law of simony and put nothing in its place ?—That is rather a difficult question to answer. My view would be that there should be a relaxation of the present law of simony. We have a law as strict as it is possible to make it, short of criminality, and yet it is evaded ; and, moreover, the clergyman is required to take an oath to the effect that he has not paid, or caused to be paid, any sum of money in any transaction which to the best of his belief is simony. The clergyman says to himself, “ In my view this is not simony.”

The clergyman knows what the meaning of “simony” in that declaration is ; he knows that it is a legal term which means contrary to the law of simony ?—Yes.

Knowing that, these moral clergymen, who first of all ask you to break the law, then take an oath that they have not broken the law ?—Yes.

So that every one of these clergymen of high standing and of high moral character has been guilty of wilful and corrupt perjury ?—It is a question as to whether it is so or not.

Mr. Jeune : They take an oath that they have not broken the law, and they have not broken the law, have they ?—It depends on how the transaction is completed.

The law says, there shall be no agreement?—No collusion.

The law says, there shall be no agreement; and in the case to which you refer there is no agreement?—No; it is merely a moral understanding between them that the resignation will take place.

So that the law is not broken, because a high authority in ecclesiastical law can discriminate between a written agreement and a verbal understanding, or, as Mr. Stark puts it, a moral understanding. Never was anything finer in the way of distinction without a difference. Let Dr. Littledale or anyone else surpass—nay, match—any one of these concrete examples of habitual “evasion” in the Established Church of England with a single one of the most extreme hypothetical, abstract cases of St. Alfonso or any other casuist of the Roman School.

It is, however, when we turn to another class of patrons and agents that the pressure of secrecy grows heaviest. Hitherto we have been speaking of those who, to borrow from Mr. Leatham’s very able and vigorous speech, are punctilious in their disregard of law and in their immorality, and who know how to draw the line somewhere, although not perhaps at perjury. Mr. Stark, and honourable men like him, can “market livings,” “sell and barter” the cure of souls, obtain the best terms for “marketable patronage” in such a way that the Church shall be “ultimately the gainer”—not “morally” it is true, but “materially;” they can enable a patron—anxious, it may be, to make provision for his son, or straitened to meet the results of extravagance*—to realize the “highest marketable value” of his living, though it be at the cost of inflicting the cruel wrong of an incapable man on the parishioners, who, it is not surprising, resent this “monstrous system of buying and selling the welfare of immortal souls,” and justly ask “what is the purchasing of a living but spiritual domination on the one side and spiritual slavery on the other?” These agents can find out and secure the best “warming-pans,”† that is,

* Speaking of the sale of the living of Astbury by the first Lord Crewe to pay the debts of his son, Mr. Herford related that once when this living was about to become vacant, one of the ladies of the Crewe family was allowed to stake it in a bet with one of the ladies of the Egerton family, the decision being made to depend upon a race between two caterpillars.

† *Appropos* of “warming-pans,” Dr. Utterton, Bishop of Guilford, mentioned the case of a very valuable living in his diocese, which had been bought in a great measure as a speculation. It was suddenly vacated by the death of the incumbent; whereupon the owner immediately put a clergyman ninety years of age into it to keep it warm, then took it into the market and sold it for £20,000, having himself given only £8,000 or £9,000 for it. Revolting enough is Lord Sidney Godolphin Osborne’s account of the wretched paralytic borne up the Church by two attendants

aged or sick men, physically unfit for the service of the Church, but ready to sell their infirmity to keep a living "warm" as it is called, in order, perhaps, that a marriageable daughter may have a requisite dowry or a useful marriage portion, and so bring about those delightful social relations charmingly suggested by Lord Justice James; all this they can do with such consummate skill that there is not the least danger of an *exposé*. Masters of ways and means, they can baffle every one. "Those who are employed"—we are forced again and again to have recourse to verbatim quotation lest we should seem guilty of exaggeration—"whose business it is to carry these things out, hedge them so carefully round, that it is next to impossible for the Bishop to find a flaw in them." Their silence, if they do not literally gain the connivance of bishops' secretaries. These trusty officers wink at such offences if they cannot condone them. They dare not grapple with them. "I make it my business," said one acting for the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of London, Winchester, Ely and Ripon, "to know as little of any of these transactions as I possibly can. Sometimes they are forced upon one's knowledge, but I always take care to keep myself absolutely out of them as far as possible." And though, elsewhere, he acknowledged that the law has been so clearly pronounced as to what is illegal that there would be no difficulty in defining it, he had frequently, when convinced in his own mind that a case was irregular, kept it from the Bishop because he knew that the Bishop could do nothing, and that it would be simply a matter of distress to him that he could take no action. Another secretary, we read, besought the witness, "Do not tell me, do not let me know anything about it," when he was proceeding to acquaint him with a "nefarious bargain." We have not yet exhausted the resources of upright agents. Masters of words, as well as of ways and means, their picturesque and practical advertisements are a veritable *pluvia laqueorum* to the impressionable natures and tender consciences of the clergy of the Established Church. Whilst the possible purchaser is attracted and fascinated by glowing accounts of convenient locality and lovely scenery; of the commodious dwelling and the roomy chambers; of the charming society, real county society; of the propinquity of admirals and baronets; of the parishioners, all of a good class, wealthy and professional men, men most kind

for his induction, and obliged to drink wine at the reading desk, in order to be able to read himself in; but still more shocking is the ghastly tale, related by Mr. Leatham, of an unhappy candidate who complained "that his chances of preferment were gone: when it was supposed that he had a cancer, he was sounded with reference to four livings; but now that it was known that he only had a tumour, patrons took no notice of him."

and hospitable; of the paucity of labour and the plenitude of pay; of the fewness of souls and the abundance of trout and rooks; of the age and infirmities of the actual incumbent—in one list handed in there were seven clergymen mentioned at 70, three at 71, two at 72, two at 73, two at 74, two at 75, two at 77, three at 78, one at 79, two at 80, one at 82, and one at 87; nor must we forget the Guilford patriarch of 90; whilst the solicited purchaser is exactly posted up in all these important details, the prospective vendor is no less carefully advised of the precise kind of Church preferment wanted to purchase. The views and the accomplishments, the university and the character and the price of the advertiser, are all categorically stated with matchless practical skill. There are moderate views, views evangelical, views *via media*, views not extreme, Broad Church, High Church, Moderate High Church. Locality, for one man, is not so much an object as a nice healthy parish and comfortable residence; incumbent's age, say about sixty, because the gentleman is at Cambridge, preparing for Holy Orders; but interest must be allowed until a vacancy. For another, the incumbent should not be younger than 70; but the poor septuagenarian must be prepared with interest till the vacancy can be claimed. Then we have hilly and bracing localities desiderated, and fen counties objected to; dry and healthy locality indispensable, climate not damp, and sandy soil. Oxford men and Cambridge men, with good characters and highest references, musical, and accustomed to educated congregations, are all waiting to purchase—in the city or the country, in London or a fashionable town, by the seaside or inland, at prices varying from £1000 to £20,000—the cure of souls.

The ingenuity and power of adaptation to circumstances of upright agents appears indeed to be inexhaustible; but there is nevertheless a point at which they stop; they even draw a line. There are "black sheep" in the Established Church as well as elsewhere; and Mr. Stark keeps a list of the "black sheep." He, and honourable men like him, will have no dealings with them. But for all that, the "black sheep" are not kept out of the verdant pastures of preferment. The market of souls is not closed to them any more than to men of the highest standing, ex-colonial bishops, canons, and other dignitaries. The "black sheep" have their own special agents. And they are men of more than Protean endowments; men to whom every conceivable species of trick and stratagem is familiar; whose stock-in-trade includes every kind of sophistry and tergiversation; whose powers of cajolery are boundless; who can wheedle an incumbent into believing the shadow the substance, make him drop his bone for a phantom, yield up the bird in his hand for two in the

bush, to draw him into the slough of simony, and then, scatheless themselves, leave him to his fate; men whose experience and discernment of spirits is such that they can gauge the exact point up to which a bishop should be trusted by his subject. They know, moreover, to a hair's breadth, the amount of persuasion that must be brought to bear upon his lordship "to induce him to suspend all personal considerations as regards views;" and though they would never venture to *dictate* the terms in which he should be addressed, for the good of their clients they must *suggest* a letter, subject to approval, "our experience being necessarily much larger than that of any beneficed clergyman, we are in a position to draw up such a diplomatic letter as has been found in other instances to be successful." In like manner, though far from intending that a patron should ever be written to otherwise than "candidly and faithfully," they are bound to impress upon their clients that "it negatives necessary and cautious diplomacy to interpret such terms as meaning a relation of confidence which would be misplaced." And though their patience is infinite in drawing fine lines to remove the scruples of those who have the happiness to be under their direction, there is a time when discussion must cease, and they must peremptorily assert their authority.

As to 'impressions abroad,' which mean so many worthless reports, they are too contemptible for notice, and if we were once to allow this office to become a medium for correcting such things we might give up all other work. . . . I have no time for many words in answer to your remarks about simony, and must content myself with saying that they have no relevancy to my suggestion upon which you appear to have founded them.

I may also add that the term simony as popularly quoted is simply an insult to ordinary intelligence, and while you have a perfect right to your opinion upon that or any other question, you must be prepared for the opinion of those who claim an equal right to the exercise of their opinion.

If you refer to the clergy who have bought their livings, whether advowsons or presentations, I do not hesitate to say that both socially and by education they are the very best men by whom the Church is served, and (if) the rights under which they purchased are to be infringed, compensation is due to them, or to speak in plain terms, they have been deliberately swindled.

The writer of this letter is a very choice specimen of the class of clerical agents who "are not always of perfectly respectable character." And his career and proceedings are so remarkable, so inconceivable to the ordinary mind, that once more we are compelled to have recourse to literal citation from the evidence

of the Royal Commission. Mr. J. Cox, a member of the Church of England, sometime justice of the peace in Derbyshire, is the witness we turn to. Questioned as to the respectability of these friends of the clergy, he said :—

I know something of the character of the principals of two firms, both of whom are doing, or have done, a large business in this matter. Mr. Workman, *alias* Rawlins, has carried on, and still carries on an extensive business as a clerical agent. He is in Holy Orders. His real name is Rawlins, but he passes under a dozen different *aliases*. One of his first notorious transactions as a clerical agent was with the Rev. N. K., in connexion with a living in the diocese of —. He cheated Mr. N. K. out of £3,000, involved him in simony, and caused him to lose both living and money. Mr. N. K. now works as a day labourer, and is usually in the workhouse in the winter. In 1852, Rawlins, or Workman, was convicted of altering figures on a cheque from £8 to £80, and was sentenced to several years' penal servitude. On coming out of prison, he at once set up as a clerical agent (he was a man of some family and private means), and he bought advowsons and next presentations of several livings, two or three of them, I am told, being openly purchased at auction in Tokenhouse-yard. He issued a monthly organ, "The Church and School Gazette," published for several years at 56, Great Russell-street, Bloomsbury, and often had some young clergyman to assist him in the traffic as secretary. One of his plans was to advertise in the "Ecclesiastical Gazette," and elsewhere. I am quoting this bit of advertisement from the "Ecclesiastical Gazette" of December, 1869, which contains this sentence, which I ought to have mentioned in speaking of N. K.'s case: "Sequestrations, either threatened or enforced, may in many instances be relieved;" and he also inserted advertisements of loans of money to clergymen moving, &c. Thus, he became acquainted with embarrassed clergy, and got many into his meshes and used them as his tools. His frequent bankruptcy illustrates his character. In 1856 he was bankrupt in his true name of Rawlins, and then consigned to the Queen's Bench Prison for three months. In 1864, on the 9th of June, he was bankrupt in the name of "James Murray Richard Rawlins, known as Richard Workman." In March, 1875, he again passed through the Bankruptcy Court as "Murray Richard Workman," and perjured himself by swearing that he had never before been bankrupt or insolvent. I have referred to the Bankruptcy Court File, No. 71,349, for his last insolvency, and I found that the principal clerical creditors (all unsecured) were the Rev. R. H. Killick, Chadwell, Essex, £3,780; Rev. G. H. Turner, Cambridge-gardens, Notting Hill, £4,000; The Rev. James Whatman, 26, Bridge-row, E.C., for a small amount; Rev. T. S., £1,200, who says that the money was "advanced on a condition which has wholly failed," and that he has "received no satisfaction or security." Among the secured creditors are Messrs. Makrell, Smith, and Hughes for £9,189 5s. 5d., secured on the advowsons of—1. Tarring

Nevill, Essex; 2. South Heighton, Essex; 3. St. Philip's, Liverpool; 4. Newton St. Petrox, Devon; 5. Branksea, Dorset; 6. Upton Snodbury, Worcester; 7. Chadwell, Essex; 8. Patcham, Sussex; 9. Stopsley, near Luton; 10. Doddbrooke, Devon; and 11. Two pieces of land adjoining the Vicarage at Denton. Another creditor was secured for £700 on the advowson of Llanstadwell, Wales. How these advowsons got into his hands may be illustrated by following up one case, most of which information can be got from papers filed at the Bankruptcy Court. In 1871, the Rev. T. S. (then vacating the rectory of E.) paid over to Workman through his solicitors £1,200. He had already placed his rectory of E. in Workman's hands for "exchange," and the £1,200 was given in trust to Workman in order therewith to complete the purchase of a more valuable living for Mr. T. S. Such a living Mr. T. S. never obtained. He could get no redress; he was like N. K., involved in a simoniacal transaction, and his claim to be scheduled as a creditor on Workman's insolvent estate was disallowed by the judge, on the ground that the transaction was illegal, and hence he lost his rectory and his £1,200, and was comparatively beggared. Thus Workman became possessed of the Rectory of E. and presented thereto the Rev. R. Y. Mr. R. Y. has actually allowed Workman to preach in E. Church. . . . Workman has so many *aliases* that Crockford, or the Clergy List, is no real guide to the livings of which he is now patron.

And, again, continuing his evidence on the same subject, Mr. Cox, at the instance of the Bishop of Peterborough, said:—

The principal (if not the sole proprietor) in another energetic firm is a man of notorious character. The firm under which title he works is a recently established, but very energetic one, Messrs. Milward and Co., whom I have referred to already. They advertise largely in other papers besides the "*Ecclesiastical Gazette*." At the time of the late Sheffield Church Congress, they day by day advertised for sale from £2,000 to £10,000, and they prominently advertised in the semi-official guide to the Church Congress. Their principal is the Rev. Samuel Shipley, late vicar of Plungar, Bottesford, near Nottingham. In 1877, he had to leave his benefice on a charge of bigamy, having married a widow lady at St. George's Hanover-square, when his own wife was living with him at Plungar. He also did business as a common usurer on the most disgraceful terms. I hand in the original letters sent by him to an east-end tradesman, answering an advertisement in the *Times*, in 1870, which will show the outrageous nature of his charges.

It is difficult to excuse the Established Church from connivance at the abominable traffic here revealed. And the evil is sapping our national truth. For, deny it who may, there is the relation of cause and effect between the simony details in

these Blue-Books and the terrible increase of popular perjury denounced by Lord Coleridge and other judges at the late Assizes.

For the last time we turn to the evidence of the Royal Commission. The Bishop of Peterborough himself shall close this melancholy exhibition of the issue of Erastian principles :—

I should very much like (he said, resigning his position of Commissioner, and taking that of witness), if the Commission will allow me to relate to them four cases which occurred in my own diocese, in which the bishop was compelled to institute persons who were utterly unfit for the parishes. They are four very remarkable cases, and I should like to have them recorded. The first was that of a paralytic, in my judgment incapable personally of performing the duties of the parish. . . . The second was a case of a man who some years previously had been a notorious drunkard, but his drunkenness and the notoriety of it had occurred beyond the limit of the Church Discipline Act two years, and I was advised that I could not refuse him institution. He was instituted to a parish within four miles of the scene of his previous drunkenness, which made him notorious, and which created a great scandal. The third was the case of a man, 75 years of age, who obtained the appointment to a parish containing two considerable country towns, a laborious parish, and who within six months after he was appointed, asked me to give him permanent leave of absence, on account of physical infirmity, and that man I was obliged to institute. The last case was the case of a man who was obliged to resign his chaplaincy to a gaol because he dared not face the accusation of having been guilty of unnatural vice. That man was presented to a living in my diocese by his father-in-law, who was a solicitor. He came into my study, and I told him that I had no evidence to prove the case, but I was morally certain of the facts, and the man did not venture to deny them to me. I told him that I would endure anything rather than institute him. Happily for me, the man was respectably married, and feared to bring shame upon his family, and would not face a public trial, and he went away and I heard no more of him; but I was apprised that I could not have legally prevented his receiving institution. I merely wish to press upon the consideration of the Commission this fact, that the very day after that man left my study he might have bought a donative, with cure of souls and with a large number of parishioners. He might have bought it in *absolute secrecy*, and could then and there have become the incumbent of the parish of the donative, and I would have had no power, even as much as of asking him, "Why do you go in there?" And that might have occurred in my own diocese, and I might have had the shame and misery of having in the cure of souls in my diocese a clergyman who had confessed to me in my own study that he had been guilty of unnatural and abominable vice. I may venture just to state this further to the

Commission, that it was under the pressure of these four cases that I introduced my Bill upon the subject into the House of Lords.

The Irish Church has been disestablished, and one of the greatest abuses of Christendom swept away, as Sir Wilfrid Lawson reminded the electors of Carlisle the other day ; purchase has been abolished in the Army, and now only remains in the State Church of England. For the sake of our cherished characteristic of straightforwardness, surely not an Englishman lives who, after due consideration of the evidence we have briefly surveyed, will not be inclined to pray that disestablishment and disendowment may quickly rid the land of the foul blot of simoniacal casuistry propagating on every side the deadly blight of falsehood and perjury.



ART. VIII.—THE CANONIZATION ON THE EIGHTH OF DECEMBER.

ON the eighth day of this last month, the ever-memorable festival of the Immaculate Conception, Pope Leo XIII. decreed the honours of the altar to four beatified servants of God, St. John Baptist de Rossi, St. Lawrence of Brindisi, St. Benedict Joseph Labre, and St. Clare of the Cross of Montefalco. Although the ceremony was performed by the Pope himself, and was followed by the Pontifical High Mass, yet it took place with closed doors, in a room whence the daylight was shut out. Hundreds of troops, and of the Roman police, were under arms at all the approaches to the Basilica of St. Peter, and hundreds more were ready in barracks at St. Angelo, the Holy Office, St. Prassede, and the Serristori. Rome was not unconscious of what was going to be done. But it was no longer as in olden days, when every Roman rejoiced if the Pope rejoiced, and mourned if he mourned. A great crowd of strangers has invaded Rome, who have no true Roman feeling or Roman tradition. On the morning of the eighth of December the newspapers of the infidel party were so noisy and irreverent, and spoke so unworthily of the new Saints and of the Pope, that even the *Opinione* could not help making a protest. Still, many thousands were devoutly expecting the signal which should announce the completion of the solemn work of so many years. Within the walls of the Vatican, the ceremony, though shut up in such a narrow space, recalled more glorious and freer days. The scene was the large hall above the portico

of St. Peter's. The work of its decoration had been entrusted to the Commendatore Francesco Fontana, architect of the Holy Apostolic palaces. The walls displayed imitation Mosaic paneling in a gold ground, with Corinthian pilasters. The whole of the ten windows which look on the piazza on one side, and into the Church on the other, were closed in, and each was changed into a tribune with three tiers of seats, reserved for the *corps diplomatique*, the Roman nobility, and various invited guests. The vast room was lighted by rows of wax candles, between the pilasters of the walls, and all the length of the cornice. Flowers in great abundance, in garlands and festoons, hung from the ceiling and in the walls. Twelve great standards were displayed on the walls, on each of which was depicted some miracle of one of the new Saints, with an explanatory Latin inscription from the pen of the Rev. Father Tongiorgi of the Society of Jesus. The lilies and the star of Pope Leo XIII. were repeated everywhere. About two-thirds of the way down the hall was placed the high altar, midway between wall and wall. At the extreme end of the room was the Pontifical throne; so that the Pontiff, with the Cardinals on either side, occupied a retro-choir, as in the ancient basilicas. The bishops occupied the space immediately in front of the altar outside the chair. Ladies were accommodated in the body of the chapel, in which a free passage had to be kept for the ceremony.

About nine o'clock in the morning, the Pope, vested in *pontificalia*, and accompanied by his court, entered the *Sala dei paramenti*, which is close to the *Sala ducale*, where he was received by the Cardinals and the Bishops assembled. Thence, to the strains of the *Ave Maris Stella*, executed by the Papal Choir to the music of Biordi, he was carried on the *sedia gestatoria* in grand procession to the hall of the Canonization. The Cardinals, Bishops, and Abbots wore the cope and mitre, the various officiating ministers of the Mass bore their appropriate vestments, and the numerous officers of the Papal Court, with the noble guards, completed the imposing array which surrounded the Vicar of Christ. As the procession entered the hall the Papal Choir sang the *Tu es Petrus* of Vittoria.

After the homage of all the members of the hierarchy present, the Holy Father received once more the humble prayers of the promoters of the causes of canonization. Once and twice he puts them off, and orders all to join in prayer for light. The Litany of the Saints is sung, and then the *Veni Creator*. At the third request, the whole audience rises, the postulator remains kneeling, and the Pope, seated on the throne, the tiara on his head, pronounces, in his chair as Doctor of the Universal Church, the following decree, which we here translate:—

To the honour of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, for the exaltation of the Catholic Faith, and the extension of the Christian religion, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and our own, after mature deliberation, and many times imploring the assistance of God, by the counsel of our Venerable Brothers, the Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, the Patriarchs, the Archbishops and Bishops at present in the City, we decree and define that the Beatified John Baptist de Rossi, Lawrence of Brindisi, Benedict Joseph Labre, Confessors, and Clare of the Cross, Virgin, are SAINTS, and we inscribe them in the catalogue of the Saints; ordaining that their memory be devoutly kept each year by the Universal Church, that is to say, that of John Baptist on the twenty-third day of May, of Lawrence on the seventh of July, of Benedict Joseph on the sixteenth of April, as Confessors, and of Clare on the eighteenth of August, among the Virgins. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Then the *Te Deum* was intoned, the bells of St. Peter's gave the signal to every Church in the city, and the canonization was complete. The Pontifical High Mass followed, with all the usual ceremonies.

In the evening large numbers of private houses were illuminated. All the afternoon, and at stated hours throughout the octave, devotions and panegyrics in honour of the newly canonized took place at different Churches. Crowds thronged to St. Peter's, to St. Augustine (in honour of St. Clare, who was an Augustinian nun); to Ara Cœli, out of devotion to St. Lawrence; to St. Mary in Cosmedin, of which St. John Baptist had been a Canon; and to St. Mary dei Monti, where lie the relics of St. Benedict Joseph. To this latter, in particular, came a great throng of French pilgrims, who were addressed by the Bishop of Arras and Père Picard.

A canonization is a fact of very great importance. It is an occasion on which the Supreme Pontiff pronounces, in the most solemn manner, on the law of Faith and Morals as carried out in the person of a mortal who has passed through the temptations of life and been judged by God for his eternity. There is no ground for doubting that the Church (and therefore the Pope, who has all the infallibility, even when he speaks before the Church, which Christ has promised to the Church herself) is infallible in the Canonization of a Saint. The consequences of a possible mistake would be too disastrous. A human being whom the Pastor of all the faithful had declared to be in the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision, would be in hell. A life and career which the supreme earthly Judge had pronounced to be not only blameless but heroic, would have been judged by the Eternal Judge to be sinful, and worthy of everlasting death. A man or woman whom the Pope, after the most searching exami-

nation, had proposed to the faithful to be honoured and prayed to as one sharing in the Table and Kingdom of Jesus Christ, would be really the slave of the demons and the companion of the lost. Doubtless, to pronounce upon Heroic Sanctity is to pronounce on a "fact," and not on a doctrine. But there are occasions when the prerogative of pronouncing infallibly on doctrine would be nugatory without the gift of pronouncing on a fact. The Church could not guard the integrity of the Sacred Scriptures unless she could, without fear of error, pronounce on this or that version of the Scriptures; she could not contend against heresy without being able to condemn infallibly a given heretic or a given book. And it is evident that the prerogative of "holiness"—her power of teaching what holiness is, and of promoting holiness in her children—would be of comparatively little use unless she could, inerringly, pronounce on the lives of the servants of God. There is, probably, no force in this world, putting aside the holy Sacraments, which is more powerful in drawing men to the service of God than the example of the Saints. But the power of a Saint's life comes from two sources: first, that his career is, beyond all doubt, a true and certain rule of virtue; and second, that he is always a living being, standing before the throne of God. But neither this force of example nor this stimulus of sympathy would be possible—taking into consideration all men and all ages—were it possible that the Church could err in defining the "sanctity" of a Saint. And, therefore, we cannot doubt that the infallibility of the Church in canonization is included in the promise that the gates of hell shall never prevail against her and that our Lord will be with her Pastors to the consummation of the world.*

The Canonization, then, of four Saints, on the 8th of December last, is an incident of very grave moment. It is likely—or, rather, it is certain—to have a twofold effect. It will tell on the servants of God, and it will affect God's enemies. It is a lesson and a stimulus to all ranks of Christian men and women; it is a proclamation of fresh supernatural forces, engaged on the side of Christ, against this world and the powers of darkness. It is

* The following passage from the well-known work of Benedict XIV. will be interesting to our readers at this moment:—"I myself, who for so many years discharged the office of Promoter of the Faith, have seen with my own eyes (if I may so express it) the Holy Spirit assisting the Roman Pontiff in the definition of causes of canonization. In some cases, when all seemed to be going on prosperously, difficulties, unperceived before suddenly came up and kept the cause back. In others, difficulties which seemed so insuperable that the cause was on the point of being stopped, were removed in the most unexpected manner by the discovery of fresh evidence, and the cause was concluded in triumph."—*De Beatificatione et Canonizatione Servorum Dei*, lib. i. cap. 44.

true, no doubt, thall all of the four newly-canonized have been long venerated in the Church. It is some twenty years since St. Benedict Joseph and St. John Baptist de Rossi were beatified by Pius IX. One hundred years have elapsed since St. Lawrence of Brindisi, was pronounced blessed by Pius VI. ; while St. Clare of Montefalco has been honoured with a Mass and Office by the Order of St. Augustine since the middle of the seventeenth century. But it is true, nevertheless, that the providence of God, in reserving their canonization to these days, has also reserved for these times its significance and its effect. The solemn act of canonization differs from every act of which they have hitherto been the object ; and so also will the issue of that act differ from all that has happened before.

This article is not intended to be a sermon. But whilst pulpits are resounding with praise and exhortation, and whilst solemn triduums are drawing crowds to many a Church in Rome, France, Italy, and Spain, there are so many aspects of the late Canonization which may well interest a thinker and a Christian that we make no apology for dwelling on it. There can be no doubt that the prayers and merits of the Saints have moulded the course of history. Slowly, with many a partial check and local failure, the power of Christ's passion, touching the world at every point where a Saint's heart is found, works on, moves masses, sweeps down pride, crushes might, and baffles science. A man who can see no further than the horizon of his own life may doubt the truth of this. The observer who stands where he can look back through history can make no mistake in the matter. And those who have no leisure or capacity for the philosophic discussion of history may take for granted that the stone which the builders rejected and do reject, on whomsoever it falls it grinds him to powder. No one but those who take the merest "naturalism" as their guide in judging consequences, can fail to understand that a Saint, and the canonization of a Saint, are matters vastly more important, in the long-run or the short, than a new republic, a new minister, or a new war.

It so happens that this company of the newly canonized includes the name of one who, in his career and spirit, stands utterly alone among all recorded Saints. The significance of the canonization of St. Benedict Joseph Labre can hardly be over-rated. It is chiefly to him that we propose to direct attention at the present moment. But first let a word be said about each of the other three.

St. Clare of Montefalco, who comes first in the order of time, was a humble nun, who lived all her life in her native town, and died there in 1308. Montefalco is a little town not far from Assisi, lying between Assisi and Spoleto. Her life, from her very

infancy, was one of amazing and supernatural austerity. Its details recall in a very striking way the life of St. Catherine of Siena, who was born forty years after her death. But the two Saints differed utterly in one point. St. Catherine had a mission from God which led her into the world of politics and of war; St. Clare never, as far as is known, left the little town of her birth, and the Convent in whose struggling beginnings she had a share. But the marvelous feature of the history of her canonization is that the present Pope, as we gather from his own words, looks upon her as a defender of the Church and of Rome, who is worthy to be named in the same sentence with St. Catherine; and that he looks to her for help in the present calamities of the Holy See, almost as confidently as to the holy Virgin of Siena herself. At the solemn publication of the decree of her canonization, in the palace of the Vatican, on the 11th of September last, he said, "Not less dear and consoling to us is the memory of the Blessed Clare of Montefalco. We remember with delight how, when we governed the Church of Perugia, we twice visited her sanctuary, and twice offered the Holy Sacrifice on the altar where her mortal remains repose. We venerated the precious and incorrupt relics of the illustrious Virgin, and particularly her heart, so famed for the wonderful marks of Our Lord's passion. And now that we are set over the Church Universal, our veneration for her has redoubled, and our trust in her is full and entire. Without doubt we may justly count on her powerful protection from Heaven. It is not the first time that God has made use of a humble virgin in the accomplishment of His inscrutable purposes for the good of the Church, and of her visible head. But yesterday the glories of the heroic Catherine of Siena were celebrated throughout Italy, on the occasion of her centenary festival; it was she who was the instrument by which the Roman Pontiffs, after a long exile, were brought back, *free and independent, to Rome, their true seat.*" These provisions of the Vicar of Christ are confirmed in a very curious manner by the fact that the incorrupt body of St. Clare, lying in its crystal case in the Church of the Convent at Montefalco, appears to be endowed with a miraculous consciousness when trouble is at hand for the Church. These signs were remarked as long ago as the times of the Reformation in Germany. There seems no reason to doubt that, on more than one occasion, the portion of dried blood which is preserved with the body, has liquefied and seemed to boil up with greater or less violence and continuousness in proportion as the trial to come was more or less severe. But what has recently happened to the body itself is still more curious and striking. Our readers are possibly aware that after "beatification" and before canonization, at least two new and incontestable

miracles are required. St. Clare was never formally beatified. As she died more than a hundred years before the decree of Urban VIII., it was admitted by the Roman Congregation that, in her case, long-continued public veneration was equivalent to "beatification." It was on September 13, 1850, that Pope Pius IX. decreed that, the heroicity of virtue having been established, the discussion of two miracles might now be taken. Now, Pope Pius had himself been Archbishop of Spoleto, the diocese in which Montefalco is. In the year 1831, his attention had been called to a very remarkable occurrence. It was the year, it will be remembered, in which the "Young Italy" party were doing their best to stir up the population of the Romagna. Spoleto itself had been occupied by 4,000 insurgent troops, and its Archbishop, though his sweetness and prudence disarmed them at last, had tasted the first-fruits of his life-long struggle with the revolution. It was reported to him, during this year, that the incorrupt body of St. Clare had moved one of its feet and turned aside its head—as if to express its horror of the impious attempts against Christ's Vicar. Whether this miracle was proved, or even juridically examined, we do not learn. It is set down, however, in the report presented by the postulators of the cause when, in 1851, they renewed their instances for proceeding to canonization; and its truth seems to follow from what is about to be related. On May 27, 1847—a few weeks before the date of a celebrated proclamation in which undoubtedly Pius IX. sounds the first note of his forebodings of 1848—the nuns of the Convent of Montefalco were in their choir about eight o'clock in the evening, and were reciting the office of complin. The "urn" or crystal case, in which was the incorrupt body of St. Clare, is placed, it should be observed, in a recess in the thickness of the wall of the choir, and the recess is enclosed by wooden doors, usually kept fast shut by a little bolt which shoots into the stone at the base of the niche itself. Suddenly the sisters heard a noise as if a bolt had been drawn, and they saw, to their amazement, the door of the recess fly open of its own accord. The same evening, after complin, two or three of the sisters went to look at the holy body. They found that the body had undoubtedly moved. The head had slipped off the pillow or cushion; the crown in one part no longer touched the cushion, though the marks of its having pressed upon it before were perfectly plain; the veil had opened as if the head had moved, and the tunic was slightly creased, as it would have been had the shoulders been bent. Moreover, a small gold crucifix, which had stood on a little base prepared for it, had fallen down and lay across the hands. Seven weeks later, on the 17th of July—the very day on which the troops of Radetsky occupied

Ferrara, and Austria did the precise thing Mazzini was longing for—the urn or reliquary of the body of St. Clare was found to be close to the iron grille which protects it. The sister sacristan had been accustomed to brush and dust the glass frequently; she found she could no longer even get her hand in; there was not a finger's breadth between the grille and the surface of the glass. There could be no doubt that the urn had moved; and it had to be forcibly pushed back to its ordinary position. Now these may seem to be small matters. But what is great and what is small? The supernatural universe is mightier than the world of Nature. Phenomena of the unseen world are indefinitely more notable than those of earthly matter and force. A miracle does not generally stir the world of politics, of letters, or of science; but it marks the nearness of God, and it sets in motion the only irresistible human force—the prayer and the suffering of human hearts. The alleged supernatural occurrences of the 27th of May and the 17th of July were inquired into with all the rigour of the Roman Congregations when there is question of canonization. First of all, the Ordinary—that is, the Archbishop of Spoleto—went into the whole matter juridically, summoning witnesses and discussing every probability of mistake or deception. Then began the Pontifical process, which was that of the Ordinary over again, but far more strict and searching. The mere letter appointing the commission, with its reiterated directions and minute provisions to secure authentic testimony, contains more than fifteen separate headings. The commission took the testimony of no less than fifty-five distinct witnesses on oath, among whom were medical experts, and a jury of ladies, who, under the direction of the medical men, took the holy body out of the reliquary and carefully examined it. The process occupied thirteen months, and the report is 400 pages in length. The miraculous moving of St. Clare's incorrupt body was considered to be proved beyond doubt. On the other miracle necessary for canonization we need not here dwell.

St. Lawrence of Brindisi, a Capuchin, was one of the great heroes of the Catholic reaction against Luther. From the year 1596, to the day of his death in 1619, he was almost incessantly occupied with religious and political missions of the first class. He was sent by Paul V. to the Emperor Rudolph and the Archduke Matthias, to secure their good-will and efforts in the Catholic cause. He cheered on the army of the Emperor in the war against the Turks—a war on which the fate of Eastern Europe depended. In more ways than one—by his preaching, his controversy, his courage and holiness—he may be said to have preserved Austria to the Church. He was the soul of the

Catholic League, and visited Philip III. of Spain in order to induce him to take part in it. His preaching secured the Catholic cause in Saxony and the Palatinate. He was known in every town of Italy, from Venice to Brindisi itself. His life presents a striking picture of the times—the Turk threatening in the East, the heretical spirit striving for Germany, Henry IV. in France, and the seeds of heresy taking root in half the towns of Italy north of Rome. It was to such men as St. Lawrence and B. Peter Canisius that it was owing that the tide so speedily turned and the new era was commenced by the convocation of the Council of Trent. St. Laurence was throughout the devoted and unwearied servant of the Holy See. No other authority would have made him visit sovereign princes, with the powers of Apostolic nuncio, or intervene in European wars and imperial councils. But it was enough for him; and in his poor friar's brown habit, without anything but what he carried about him, he changed kingdoms, strengthened kings, stopped wars, and reformed whole populations. He was beatified by Pius VI. in 1783.

John Baptist de Rossi was the Vincent de Paul of Rome in the eighteenth century. A Genoese by birth, he studied at the Roman College, and after his ordination gave himself up to the spiritual service of the people of Rome. He preached to the cattle drivers in the Campo Vaccino; he founded refuges for poor girls, and for pilgrims; he visited and catechized in the prisons. The streets called the *Bocca della Verità* and the *Montanara* knew him well for many years. The Church of St. Mary in *Cosmedin*, of which he was a Canon, which had been deserted before his time, could hardly contain the crowds of the poor who flocked to his confessional. The revenues of his canonry he gave up to the fabric of the Church and to the establishment of a fund to keep up the organ and to pay the organist. When at length a stroke of apoplexy struck him down in the midst of his labour, he was found to have died so poor that the hospital *La Trinità* had to bury him (1764). After a process which lasted from 1781 to 1859, he was declared Blessed by Pope Pius IX. in the latter year.

By far the most remarkable feature of the great ceremony of December the eighth was the canonization of St. Benedict Joseph Labre. This "holy poor man" has been virtually venerated as a Saint, especially in France, almost ever since he died. From a merely human point of view, the details of his life are, in many ways, repulsive. His vocation was literally unique. In canonizing him, the Church has laid down one of these landmarks which keep morality in its place. It is absolutely necessary to study and to understand why she has raised to her altars the beggar who had no need to beg. Even "mode-

rate" organs of opinion in Italy and France have remonstrated with the Pope for so far presuming on the piety of Catholics as to present for their homage such a life as his. The truth is that the world is fast losing sight of some of the foundation truths in which virtue, even in the natural order, must rest, in order to be virtue at all.

Mendicancy is, no doubt, an exceptional vocation. The general law is, that a man must work if he wishes to eat. But this law, and similar laws, are rather transcripts or expressions of what must generally happen, than true laws of nature or of God. It is nearly always true, for instance, that a sturdy beggar is an idle and good-for nothing fellow. Similarly, it is true, in general, that a man who withdraws himself into absolute solitude, is a misanthropist or a lunatic; and that a man who condemns himself to perpetual silence is either a fanatic or an imbecile. But mendicancy, absolute solitude, and complete silence may, for all that, be praiseworthy and even heroic. The reason is easily seen when we consider for a moment what is the measure of human actions. Good and bad, morality and immorality, must not be calculated by the rule of visible usefulness or of profit to others, whether temporal or spiritual. A man's being is made, first of all, for God; his duty to God consists above all in the intensity and continuousness of the direction of his heart towards God; and whatever best promotes his heartfelt love and worship is the best for him. (Whether this rule of action is not also the best measure of one's *ultimate* usefulness to one's neighbour, is a question we do not pause to discuss, though there can really be no question about it.) In exceptional instances, then, a man can love and adore God best, and can come nearest to Him, by adopting extraordinary means—such as intense suffering, total withdrawal from the world, or the life of a beggar. Such means are usually extremely painful to the flesh or humiliating to the spirit, and the repugnance of nature results (if the person is rightly and prudently advised in adopting them), in a very intense heat of Divine love. With most persons the opposite result would follow. Just as the powerful forces of Nature—steam, or electricity, or water—if they act under the right conditions, produce great and beneficial results in speed or motion, but if there is anything wrong about the conditions they are proportionately calamitous and disastrous; so these strong applications of our Lord's cross to human hearts either make those hearts heroic in holiness, or degrade, harden, and ruin them. Both of these results are before our eyes every day. Numbers of the ordinary poor and wretched exemplify the latter; the former finds its expression in the lives of such saints as Benedict Joseph Labre.

St. Benedict Joseph was French by race and birth, and Catholic

France, whilst she rejoices at his canonization, looks for seasonable help in his intercession. The little town of Ammettes, where he was born, is near Boulogne, and was in the diocese of Boulogne until the re-arrangement of the country by Napoleon. It is now in the diocese of Arras. Many of our readers may remember the superb fêtes which were organized in 1860, when the Saint was beatified, by Mgr. Parisis, then Bishop of Arras. We may look for equally splendid manifestations of faith from the present Bishop, Mgr. Lequette, and from his people. The Bishop has never flagged in his devotion to the cause. By word and by sacrifice he has promoted the canonization: a pastoral letter, in June last, moved the whole of his clergy and diocese to take part in the work; and he was in the loggia of the Vatican when the voice of Leo XIII. gave the decisive decree which raised the "holy poor man" to the altars of the universal Church. At Ammettes, the house in which he was born is still in existence; and in 1860 a great pilgrimage, conducted by the late Bishop, flocked to visit it as a sanctuary. The Saint was not what is technically called of gentle birth. His father was a trader; but there is no doubt the family were well off. The children were well brought up, liberally educated, and carefully looked after. Benedict Joseph—his two names probably owe their origin to the fact of his having been born in the month of March, and during the octave of St. Benedict—went through the ordinary grammar-school studies, not only with the exemplary piety and wonderful maturity of Divine wisdom which we so often see in the childhood of saints, but also with a great liking for study itself. But when he was sixteen, a change came over him, and his vocation began to declare itself. Benedict was not to be a student. It took some little time to make this clear to his friends. His uncle, a good and learned parish priest who took great pains with him, was puzzled, naturally, to find him losing all taste for Latin and mathematics. And afterwards, various worthy professors, in different monasteries where he made experiments in the life of austerity to which God called him, were scandalized at his apparent inability to bring his thoughts to bear on rhetoric or logic. For he went into and out of several monastic houses in search of his vocation. At the age of eighteen he presented himself at the gate of La Trappe; but the Trappists told him he was too weak and delicate to think of such a life as theirs, and he had to go home again. He then tried a Carthusian monastery. The Carthusians sent him back to learn plain chant and a "little logic." He made the attempt, not very successfully, and was received as a postulant; but in five months' time he began to be so troubled, perplexed, and

agitated, that the Father Prior dismissed him in all haste. He made another attempt on La Trappe, but met with no better success. He next thought of the Cistercians, and was actually received as a novice at Sept Fontaines. But in six months, what with illness and mental trouble, he was reduced to a skeleton, and had to be sorrowfully dismissed. As he was leaving the kind monks of Sept Fontaines, very sad, and not knowing where to turn to lead that austere life to which he felt himself called, yet with a "*fiat voluntas Dei*" on his lips, God gave him one of those sudden and decisive illuminations which not only the saints, but ordinary inferior persons who have taken all fitting human means to understand His will, are sure to have vouchsafed them when the moment has arrived. Benedict heard an interior voice, which plainly ordered him to lead such a life as St. Alexis led; to abandon friends and country, to adopt all the rigours of poverty and mendicancy, and to wander about the world from one shrine to another. When this voice was heard in his heart, peace fell upon him and his troubling ceased. But it is not to be wondered at that others did not at once accept his extraordinary vocation. More than one of his confessors refused, at first, to allow that it could be God's will for him to beg and not to work. One, whose name is mentioned in the process of his beatification, told him to go and get work; to engage as a servant; to find out some one who would employ him. Benedict obeyed; he went from one to another; but no one would engage him. He looked so wretched, so ragged, and so thin, that every one turned away from him in dismay. Another confessor—this was at the celebrated Sanctuary of Loreto—treated him as a reprehensible vagrant, and told him he could not in conscience lead such a life without an inspiration from God. Then Benedict, doing violence to his humility, was forced, by his command, to tell him all the circumstances of his heavenly illumination on leaving Sept Fontaines. Others spoke to him strongly about the dangers of a roving life in the world, and advised him to take shelter as soon as possible in a cloister. One kind person, at Loreto, was overcome with compassion at the terrible life he was leading, and recommended him to stay altogether at Loreto and serve Masses in the Church; or to become a Camaldolese on the neighbouring mountain. But Benedict knew what God wished him to do; and he persuaded all his confessors with little difficulty that he was right. For it must be borne in mind that he was well aware of the obligation which every Christian has, to submit interior inspirations to the judgment of confessors, or other prudent and learned men. He did this in the beginning of his wonderful vocation, and he continued to do it till the day of his death.

This man, who was called to live the life of a poor beggar, was brought up in comfortable circumstances—gently, kindly, and carefully; he was fairly educated; he was not unacquainted with literature; and he had a circle of good, kind, and what we should call respectable relations. He had the gentleness, modesty, and politeness of true humility and charity. Even in his rags he had a certain air of distinction, and more than one witness speaks of the fineness of his hands, an index of refinement which is seldom false. He was by no means strong, and apparently very sensitive. All through his life he seems to have had extraordinary sensible devotion to our Lord's passion, to the Blessed Virgin, and to the Saints. Some touching stories are related of his kindness to other children when he was himself a child. At the age of fifteen he lavishly exposed his life daily when an epidemic visited his native place. He had a marvellous gift of comforting those who were in sorrow. Though a beggar himself, he thought continually of the poor, and gave away to his brother beggars nearly all that was given to him. He keenly felt how repugnant his rags and dirt must have been to those who came near him; and this sensitiveness must certainly have been one of his greatest mortifications, although we read that in reality few, or none, ever perceived anything offensive; but he displayed the greatest anxiety to keep out of people's way, to move off when any one came, and to hide and bury himself out of sight.

Prepared thus in body, in heart, and in mind to feel in all their sharpness the thorns of the thorny crown destined for him, Benedict was led by the Holy Spirit to his vocation. He abandoned his home and his parents for good, after his repulse from the Cistercian house of Sept Fontaines, when he was twenty years old. From that time forward his parents and his family must have lost sight of him altogether. No allusions to his relations or his home are met with during the rest of his life. God called him to wander as a mendicant, but his wanderings were to be pilgrimages. To the end of his life, which lasted twelve years after his leaving Sept Fontaines, he went from sanctuary to sanctuary. He first went to Loreto, thence to Assisi, and thence to Rome. At Rome he spent, perhaps, more time than at any other single place; but it was his wish and desire to visit Loreto every year of his life, and we read that he actually did visit that greatest of Mary's sanctuaries no less than eleven times during the twelve years. The list of his visits included Rome, Loreto, Assisi, Fabriano (where rests the body of St. Romuald), Bari (which possesses the relics of St. Nicholas), Naples, Alvernia, Einsiedeln (whither his devotion drew him twice), and places, not named, in Germany and on the frontiers of France. His journeys were the journeys of a true pilgrim. He

seems generally not to have travelled by the roads, such as they were, but to have made his way across country, with only a general notion of the direction of the place to which he was going. His last journey from Loreto to Rome took him more than three weeks, the distance being about 100 miles. During these journeys he was often overtaken by storms, by snow, or by floods, and had to lie in the forest, or shelter on the mountain for days together, far from the dwelling of men. When he arrived—ragged, weary, and weak with privation—at the shrine for which he was bound, his first thought was the church; indeed, it was his practice to remain in the church or before the shrine simply the whole day, from the moment the doors were opened until the church was cleared and the doors shut at night. And it generally happened that he lay down to rest on the steps of the church itself, or sat near the door with his head leaning in his hand, till the morning came round again. When he did not rest at the church door, he took refuge under an arch or a wall. When in Rome he used frequently to spend the night under the ruined vaults of the Colosseum—a solitary watcher in that most haunted precinct of the whole world. A portico or the warmth of a bakehouse was a rare luxury with him. Sometimes the kindness of the good people, full of faith and Catholic understanding, would force him to spend the night within the walls of a house; then he chose the garret or the cellar. He bade his hosts lock him up as a vagrant is locked up; and the bed, if bed there were, was very rarely slept upon. His food was hardly human food. The very dole of the poor—the soup, the fragments of bread, and the scraps of meat—were too good for him. He would give away his portion to his mendicant friends; and he tells us himself, in words which were never meant to be known save to one man, how he lived. “I feed myself,” he said, “on refuse and the things I find thrown away in the streets—orange-peel, cabbage-leaves, decayed fruit, anything that is cast out of the windows as useless. I only eat what is sufficient for the day, and at night nothing. If I find nothing, I ask for alms. If nothing is given me, I go into the fields and eat green leaves and drink the water I find.” His pious friends often asked each other where and when he took his meals. They ceased to wonder when they at last observed that about mid-day he would leave the church, where he had been spending the long hours of the morning, and seek his dinner in the gutters and the middens of the neighbourhood. Some one disturbed him at his prayers one day, and through charity begged him to come to dinner. “Dinner!” he said; “I dine in the street.” When he did sit down to table, it was less to eat than to obey or to gratify the kindness of his friends. He had a sort of pain in accepting

ordinary food. "The poor should eat bits," he used to say. With a wooden basin, broken at the edge, cracked and mended with wire, he would take his place in the rank of the poor people awaiting the distribution at the door of a convent or a great house. If he was late, he would kneel down where the distribution had been made and gather up in his hands the spilt soup mingled with dirt, for his own meal. His clothes were even worse than his food. It does not appear that he had made any vow of poverty, yet his real poverty was greater than that of a Capuchin. His clothes were mere rags. In this country any one who knows the poorer quarters of a large town knows what raggedness is. The marvels of shapelessness, misfit, oddness, and decomposition, which sometimes are perilously held together over the breasts and limbs of the poor little boys of our schools are well known to priests and teachers. But it is not so common to see a grown-up man in such a plight; and when we see such a one, the feeling is that a Christian country is to blame for allowing such a sight to be possible. St. Benedict Joseph chose, of his own accord and by God's vocation, to go about the world in rags so desperate, that in this country at the present day he would have been forcibly taken to the poor-house; not that his clothing was not sufficient for modesty, for no one could be more scrupulous on such a point than he, but simply because people in these days cannot bear the sight of extreme wretchedness, and cannot understand the Divine calling of evangelical poverty. But undoubtedly the most remarkable feature in the vocation of St. Benedict Joseph was that he was not only poor and ragged, but that he chose and cherished personal dirt. It is impossible to describe, in this place, this voluntary cross and affliction of noisome uncleanness by which God willed that he should purify his heart and give it more completely to Himself. No instructed Catholic, it need hardly be said, will for one moment shrink from admitting it. No excuse whatever is needed for it. Putting out of the question annoyance to others, on which we shall remark presently, dirt or uncleanness is, as far as morality goes, simply indifferent. Whether a man, in order to detach his heart and to love God, washes or abstains from washing; whether he gives up alcohol or abjures soap; whether he lies on a hard bed, or never puts on a clean shirt; these things are indifferent; they may all be good, and they may all be vitiated by vanity, selfishness, or laziness. No doubt the presumption, in regard to one who is dirty, is that he is lazy, gross, and inconsiderate of others. But it is only a presumption, and the truth may be very different. And it is to be feared that there is a very strong presumption against the most of those who cultivate with such a loud-tongued devotion

the virtue of cleanliness ; a presumption that they are clean because it is a bodily luxury to be clean and to be considered clean. But the matter is too simple to require discussion. Some of the saints, like St. Bernard, St. Francis de Sales, and St. Philip Neri, have been characterized by extreme love of cleanliness ; others, like many of the ancient hermits, and St. Benedict Joseph, have been called by a different way. They were all saints, not because they were clean or because they were dirty, but because they loved God in a heroic way with all their hearts. It is true that it cannot be pleasing to God to annoy one's neighbour. Let it be observed that St. Benedict Joseph was most careful on this point. He kept out of everyone's way. But the truth is, explain it how we may, there was no annoyance to others resulting from his extraordinary vocation. Many persons, it is true, knowing how the case stood, were disgusted, and would not go near him. But, on the other hand, many persons—and more, as he became better known at Loreto and in Rome—did their very best to induce him to lodge with them and to eat with them ; and we never hear of any manifestation which was calculated to make it unpleasant for them. For some time before his holy death he lodged in the Ospizio dei Poveri, at Rome ; he rarely used a bed, but when he did, it is attested that no mark was ever left behind that could be attributed to the special cross which he bore for the mortification of his flesh.

Such, in a brief sketch, are the characteristic features of the career of a Saint whom Leo XIII. raised to the altars on the eighth of December last. It is only the truth to say that so remarkable a canonization has never been made by the Church. There have been no examples in the history of sanctity of a life such as that of St. Benedict Joseph. During his life he was often likened to St. Alexis, who, in the early centuries of Christianity, left his home and wandered over the world in poverty. We have few details of the life of St. Alexis, and we cannot therefore tell exactly what his spirit was. That he was poor and that he had left all his honours and comforts behind, and that he wandered as a stranger—this we know ; but the poverty of St. Benedict was of a type so extraordinary and complete that we find nothing in the life of St. Alexis with which to compare it. The venerable Gregory Lopez, in the sixteenth century, left his native country, crossed the ocean to Mexico, and lived as a hermit in various places, practising extreme poverty. But St. Benedict was no hermit ; and besides, he was, by his own deliberate profession, a beggar ; in which he distinctly differs from one who merely practises holy poverty. The Venerable Claude Bernard, converted by St. Francis de Sales in the year of the Saint's death, parted with his wealth, and was called "the

poor priest." He begged and lived with beggars; but chiefly as a means to further good works. The Venerable Father Libermann, almost in our day, practised holy poverty so far as to become a mendicant, lodging in a garret and consorting with the poor; but he, too, had a further end and purpose in his view. May of the great saints, like St. Ignatius, have at some period of their lives begged from door to door, and lived like beggars. But perhaps no one has ever made it a *vocation*, like St. Benedict Joseph. It is not even true to say that his vocation was that of a pilgrim. To make pilgrimages was part of the command which God laid on him; but it is apparent to the most casual student of his history that these journeyings were only occasions for the practice of the hardships and humiliations of a mendicant.

To canonize one who was by profession a beggar is certainly a very marked lesson for modern society. It is not, perhaps, so much that under modern police systems mendicancy is put down by the law. It has always been recognized, even by the Popes themselves, that begging ought not to be indiscriminately allowed. The sturdy beggar not only cheats the charitable, but also cheats the really poor. In England, and also in France, though the law is formally against public begging, yet as a matter of practice, if the beggars are modest and judicious, begging is allowed to go on. The law, and the Charity Organization Societies, put just sufficient pressure on public begging to prevent it from becoming a public nuisance, but not to prevent the tramp tribe from flourishing and doing harm to the deserving poor. There is no doubt that public opinion in England, at least of the majority—though the noisiest part of the community express opposite views—is in favour of a moderate toleration of begging; and this because there is a confused feeling that it is not all the deserving poor who are looked after by the relieving officer or housed in the union. But the public mind of a Protestant country like this is made up on two points at least; first, that no man should beg when he can work; secondly, that the sight of a ragged and wretched beggar is not only unpleasant, but, to use a vague and favourite word, "demoralizing."

It is against these opinions, unchristian when absolutely stated, that the present Canonization may be expected to tell. To be a beggar, for a time or for life, for a further purpose, or as a final vocation, may be lawful and may be heroically holy. This is the Gospel teaching. The very meaning of the Incarnation is that the Lord of all things humbled himself to ask food and a shelter from His creatures. If mendicancy truly sanctify the heart of the mendicant, then his fellow men must permit him to beg, and must help him. This very statement of the principle shows how

rare such a vocation may be. In certain religious orders, it is true, begging is permitted and commended. In these cases, each vocation is examined and tested by well-understood methods. But the vocation of a beggar who is independent and alone must be proved by time and by hard rebuffs; it must approve itself to confessors of various degrees of learning and of different characters; it must stand the test of opposition from good men, and it must be accompanied by all the virtues of a Christian life. Therefore it is sure to be rare, and most rare. But it is not so rarely that it is lawful for a time or for a purpose. And when Christians have reason to suppose that a beggar stands before them who is called to be a beggar by Christ, they are bound to supply his moderate needs and to give him the scanty means of continuing to live and to follow his Master. That he is able to work is nothing to the purpose. There are many ways of working. A mendicant who prays and suffers will bring more blessings on the people who help him and on his fellow-countrymen, than the man who tills the soil, melts the ore, or sails on the sea. That he robs the helpless poor is not true either. The little he takes is as nothing; and he does many a good turn both to rich and poor, like St. Benedict Joseph did.

But, perhaps, the strongest feeling which evangelical mendicancy or poverty has to face in these countries is, that the poor have no right to harrow our feelings or disgust our sensibilities by the exhibition of their wretchedness. This, it is to be supposed, is the meaning of "demoralization," in this connection. To witness wretchedness is to tolerate it; and to tolerate it is to sin against the materialistic Gospel which ordains that the last end of man is placed here below, and consists in rational enjoyment of the good things of this world. It is quite time to make a solemn and loud protest against the worldliness that would shut up the poor out to sight. It must be clearly understood that the duty of giving is not the only duty which a Christian has towards the poor of Jesus Christ. The law in this country provides that no one need die of starvation. With whatever drawbacks, the nation supports its poor. But if we had swept all the necessitous and wretched into workhouses and refuges, and if we freely paid our poor-rates and our subscriptions, then we should have reason to be sorry for what we had done. We require the poor quite as much as the poor require us. They are intended to be in the place of Jesus Christ, and to be at once a lesson, a motive of devotion, and a stimulus to detachment from this world. The lesson they preach is that money and comfort are precarious and transitory. Our devotion or compassion to a poor man or woman is devotion to our Lord Himself. The service of our hands and the sensibility of our hearts are owing to the poor; they are a part of our

worship of God. Personal intercourse with misery is good for us. It disturbs our sense of wellbeing and ruffles worldly comfort; it stirs us up to give our hearts more entirely to God, and to care less about having and getting, about enjoying and holding fast. The sight of the hunger of little children, of the hard and cheerless lives of women, of the dreadful sufferings of those whom disease has taken hold of, of the infinite varieties of pain and the endless forms of wretchedness, are very effectual in helping a man out of his selfishness. These things are inexplicable and confounding on any theory of nature alone, or of an existence that ends with death. Poverty and suffering keep God present to the hearts of those who minister; and whilst hope in the future never fails, there is earnestness, devotedness, and unworldliness in the present. Blessed are they who understand the poor and the needy!

ART. IX.—THE LAND LEAGUE AND THE LAND ACT.

The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881.

THE year which has just closed will be long remembered as an eventful epoch in the history of Ireland; not so much by its striking and sensational incidents, as by its association with the great measure of land reform which it is the object of the present article to elucidate and discuss. The State trials, the gigantic growth and ultimate suppression of the Land League, the coercion bills, and the arrest of the popular leaders, may sink into oblivion; but the Land Act must, for good or ill, continue for an indefinite term to regulate the future fortunes of the country. It places the agrarian population in an entirely new position; and on the use made of this position will depend the prosperity of the farmers, the harmonious relations of classes, and the welfare of the entire community. Eviction has been rendered impossible, tenant-right recognized to the fullest extent, and an undefined proprietary right conferred on the occupier, who must now, for many purposes, be regarded as the real owner of the land, subject to the payment of an annual sum.

So completely are the old ideas of landlord and tenant swept away by this measure, that we can only compare the change to the crossing of a mountain ridge, whereby in a few steps we find ourselves in a totally new country, bounded by a fresh horizon. Our dim eyes cannot, indeed, pierce the mists that veil the distance; but they can just decipher on the arms of the sign-post—To the Valley of Contentment—To the City of Sedition—To the Desert of Famine—To the great Plain of Destitution. On the choice now made of those branching roads depends the ultimate destination of the people of Ireland in one or the other of

those allegorical habitations. The year 1881 furnishes a new point of departure for the tenant farmers of the country. The acrimonious past is, if they choose, completely obliterated; and they have it in their power to start on a new career with advantages which have never been hitherto bestowed on any agricultural community. Still, it must be remembered that many of them, even with the legislative boon of secure tenure and moderate rent, are very far from being placed in a position of even comparative comfort. The improvidence of perpetual subdivision has reduced the area of many holdings below what is capable of supporting a family, and the incubus of debt still remains to paralyze the energies of some of the farmers. Notwithstanding these material difficulties, if landlords and tenants alike loyally accept the measure as a final settlement of this vexed question, and manfully set to work to develop the resources of the soil, there is still hope of better things, and a contented and happy Ireland would seem to be within the bounds of possibility. If, on the contrary, the present concession is seized as a vantage ground for fresh and more vigorous agitation, if political aspirations and dreams of national independence usurp men's minds, it is not difficult to foresee a long period of struggle and strife. Before we conclude we shall have to consider the dangers which stand in the way of the Land Act as a measure of true reform; but we must, in the first place, briefly record the circumstances under which it was passed, the reception which it met with, and the decisions which have already been given by the gentlemen entrusted with its execution.

In order to give any adequate idea of the conditions under which the Land Act of 1881 was presented to Parliament, we must go back rather more than two years to the time when the formidable organization of the Land League usurped the government of the country, and compelled or seduced the tenants to submit to its brigand authority. The establishment of such a body was rendered possible by the melancholy circumstances of the time, for it will be within the recollection of our readers that a grievous calamity befel the agrarian population of Ireland in the autumn of 1879. The exceptional inclemency of that season, the incessant rain and absence of sunshine reduced the harvest to less than one-half of its average amount. The blow fell with deadly effect on a people whose resources were already enfeebled by three bad years; and famine was, during the early months of 1880, averted only by the strenuous efforts of public and private charity. From all parts of the world subscriptions flowed in for the relief of the suffering poor; and so successfully were these funds administered that no single instance was recorded of death from actual starvation. The very extremity of distress was, however, experienced in many localities, and the sufferings and privations endured by

the class of small farmers were such as no words could adequately describe. Empty stomachs do not tend to produce political contentment, and material discomfort has always been a potent ally of revolutionary doctrine. Ireland in 1879 was no exception to this rule, and the country was well prepared, by hunger and privation, for the favourable reception of seditious counsels. These were supplied in no stinted measure. From the month of June, when the anti-rent agitation was first formulated by Davitt and Parnell, until the suppression of the Land League more than two years later, a flood of sedition was poured into the ears of the peasantry by the industrious propagandists of this new revolution. To the released convict, we believe, is to be ascribed the ingenious idea of making political capital out of the visitation of Providence; and Irishtown, a wretched village in Mayo, enjoys the questionable fame of being the place where the anti-rent doctrine received its first distinct promulgation. Mr. Parnell, however, ran him close for first honours; since, on June 16th, at Milltown in Galway, we find the member for Meath enunciating, in a very complete form, the subsequent doctrine of the League. "Keep a firm grip of the land if you can pay no rent," was his advice at this meeting, where banners were displayed bearing the inscriptions, "Down with the Land Robbers," "The Land for the People," &c. &c.

These early demonstrations are only of importance as fixing the commencement of this Communistic movement, and showing how completely the plan of campaign had even thus early been settled in the minds of the prime movers.

It was not until October, when the Home Rule Convention had collapsed, that the National Land League was formally started on its baneful career. Its professed objects were that only a *fair* rent should be paid, that no one should take a farm from which another person had been evicted, and that combination should be promoted among the tenants to secure these purposes. These, however, by no means exhausted the real objects of its founders. It is now abundantly clear that the chief aim of the astute organizers of the League was political, and not social. The "Home Rule" party was threatened with disruption; that cry was becoming discredited with the country by the absence of achievement, and new tactics were absolutely necessary if the people were to be retained in unquestioning obedience. The sufferings of the farmers furnished a new fulcrum on which to rest the political lever. The barren cry of Home Rule was for a time abandoned, and the living reality, "The Land for the People," was blazoned on a thousand banners. There was nothing abstract or difficult of comprehension in those words. They appealed to the cupidity of 600,000 tenants, many of whom were, or considered themselves, aggrieved by rack-renting landlords. The doctrine was presented in specious

colours, and its morality was not too curiously examined by those who would largely benefit by its practical application. But how was this to help the "National" cause? and why are we to attribute to Mr. Parnell far-seeing designs upon the unity of the Empire, when there was, in truth, so much in the condition of the people to arouse the sympathies of the hardest-hearted politician? We will answer the latter question first, and it is an easy task, for Mr. Parnell has himself openly avowed that, "I would not have gone to this work if I had not known that we were laying the foundation in this movement for the regeneration of our legislative independence." He is not given to hasty or ill-considered utterances; and, moreover, his subsequent action has been consistent with this frank declaration of policy. His anxious desire to frustrate the operation of the Land Bill, both in Parliament and after it became law, is only to be explained by his own confession that he had ulterior views, and by the absolute necessity of fostering the spirit of discontent if any political object was to be gained through the action of the Land League.

The answer to the other question, How was the agitation to help the "National" cause? opens up one of the most anxious problems of the future. We cannot ignore the fact that English rule is unpopular in Ireland. A *plébiscite* on the simple issue, "Union or Separation," would undoubtedly result, in three out of the four Provinces, in an extraordinary majority for the latter. In this majority would be found, practically, the entire body of tenant farmers; while the minority would be almost exclusively composed of the owners of land, who have, indeed, been occasionally stigmatized as "the English garrison." Now, whatever tends to increase the feeling of hostility towards this "garrison," tends to make their permanent occupation of the country less secure; and, if they could be only bought out, or driven away, the hands of the disaffected majority would be considerably strengthened. This seems to have been the subtle motive of the agitators in seeking the abolition of landlordism. But there was also another way in which the "National" cause might be helped forward—namely, by disgusting England with the burthen of Irish government; and this result has, without doubt, been partially achieved. The forcible retention of a struggling child, although it costs a strong man little effort, seriously impairs his power of doing any useful work; and the position of Ministers and Parliament is somewhat similarly embarrassed by the engrossing attention required by Irish affairs. If the situation could only be rendered quite unbearable, if Ministers would lose their tempers, and declare to Ireland, "You are not worth the trouble of keeping! Go, and set up for yourself!" the object of Mr. Parnell would have been won as completely as if gained on a hard-fought battle-field.

In this manner, Irish discontent and English inconvenience—the two forces threatening the union—were intensified by the Land Agitation; and though they have not acquired sufficient strength to overcome the forces of cohesion, yet they have contributed to that end; and at some future time their influence may be felt as a powerful auxiliary in favour of some scheme of National Separation. The tendency of the agitation in this direction is, at all events, quite sufficient to furnish a clue to Mr. Parnell's ulterior motives. A futile effort was made in November, 1879, to check the movement, by the prosecution of Davitt, Killen, and Daly; but the Government, seeing how hopeless was their chance of obtaining a conviction, abandoned the trials. These abortive proceedings gave fresh confidence to the agitators, who now found themselves above the law, through the popularity of their doctrines. With untiring energy, skill, and perseverance, did the Land Leaguers develop and mature their ingenious system. Meetings were held every Sunday in various parts of the country, in order to disseminate the doctrine and cement the organisation of the League. Branches were founded in every remote village, from Donegal to Cork, and paid emissaries instructed the local bodies in the "principles" on which they should act. Funds were raised by the voluntary or enforced subscriptions of the members, and the landlords had the mortification of knowing that the unpaid rent flowed into the coffers of their enemies. The material resources were further recruited by an American begging-tour undertaken by Mr. Parnell during the winter, in the course of which he sought to rouse the sympathies of his hearers by unmeasured and indiscriminate abuse of his political opponents. The platform, however, was not in the meantime deserted. The education of the masses was continued, Sunday by Sunday, until the greater part of Ireland was reduced to a condition of anarchy. The mournful state of the country, at the close of the year 1880, can only be ascribed to the action of the Land League, assisted by the pressure of general want. The cardinal principle of the League was, as we have seen, to strike against rent; for, whether the order is to pay "no rent," or a "fair rent," does not seem to matter much if the standard of fairness is the opinion of the payer, an opinion which he is ready to uphold by irrefragable arguments. The advice given to the tenants was sometimes in one form, sometimes in the other, according to the extent to which the speaker had imbibed the principles of communism. A "strike" against rent is not a happily chosen expression. The term is borrowed from a totally different transaction, where men decline to work unless they obtain some concession from their employers; but men on strike do not—and this would be necessary to render the

cases analogous—insist on retaining forcible possession of the master's tools, or the master's manufactory. The Irish tenant, on the contrary, who violates his contract, and refuses to pay rent, has not the slightest idea of surrendering possession of the farm. That part of the contract, being beneficial to himself, is to be scrupulously observed; while the rest is repudiated as oppressive and unjust. This is, of course, not moral, nor is it legal; but morality was obscured by self-interest, and the processes of law were very soon paralyzed by combination and violence. The whole fabric of the organization was founded on plunder, and supported by terrorism. A sufficiently large number of the tenants were ready to listen to any scheme for the abolition of rents, and to go any lengths to achieve success; and those who were averse to bare-faced robbery, allowed themselves to be easily coerced into submission. It is said that the tenantry on an estate in Meath actually formed an association for the purpose of friendly intimidation. The house of each, in turn, was nocturnally visited by the rest, with the usual accessories of blackened faces, firing of guns, &c., and the terrified inmate, having been dragged from his bed, was compelled to swear that he would pay no rent unless a substantial reduction was allowed. The agent, or landlord, should be hard-hearted indeed, if he continued to demand a full rent after hearing of such an interview; but, unfortunately, in the majority of cases, the outrages were only too real, and the progressive increase will be rendered apparent by the following table, showing the numbers of agrarian crimes, of the several classes, for each month of the fatal year 1880 :—

Agrarian Outrages in 1880.

Month.	Against the Person.	Against Property.	Against Public Peace.	Threatening Letters.	Total.
January . .	23	20	34	37	114
February . .	17	10	31	39	97
March . . .	8	8	24	43	83
April . . .	10	14	19	24	67
May	6	29	19	34	88
June	14	16	28	32	90
July	3	15	24	42	84
August . . .	11	22	26	44	103
September .	10	49	44	65	168
October . .	15	63	36	155	269
November .	23	73	124	341	561
December .	39	107	239	481	866
Total . . .	179	426	648	1,337	2,590

The note appended to these figures in the Statistical Return presented to Parliament is in these words: "The Peace Preservation Acts all expired on 1st June;" and the reader cannot fail to be struck by the rapid manner in which the figures in the several columns increase from that date; so much so, indeed, that almost 80 per cent. of the outrages of the year took place in the later half. It may be mentioned that the 179 outrages in the first column included eight homicides and twenty-four cases of firing at the person. The 426 against property comprised 210 incendiary fires and 101 mutilations of cattle; and among the 648 against the public peace are to be found sixty-seven cases of firing into dwelling houses, and 239 crimes of intimidation other than threatening letters, which are placed in a column by themselves.

The condition of the country at the close of 1880 may be described as one of utter lawlessness. The crimes which we have tabulated were as a rule unpunished, juries disregarded their oaths, and, whether from fear or favour, refused to convict even on the clearest evidence. Many persons, hitherto esteemed as benefactors of their country, went about guarded by constabulary, in terror of their lives. Intimidation was triumphant, and the fulfilment of legal obligations exposed honest men to the most odious forms of persecution. The courts of law were powerless to protect the rights of the subject, for no one could be found hardy enough to risk his life by serving a writ. In a word, society was disorganized, and violence and rapine reigned in the place of law and order.

Two incidents of the year cannot be passed over in silence, the State Trials and the Reports of the Commissions. Mr. Parnell and his associates were, on the 28th of December, placed on their trial for seditious conspiracy, and a more dreary uneventful proceeding never dragged its slow length along under the dome of the Four Courts. It was a foregone conclusion that the jury would disagree, and the flagging interest was not sustained even by the presence of the principal "traversers," who were permitted by the form of the prosecution to attend to their "duties" in Parliament while the trial was proceeding.

The Reports of the two Commissions dealing with the condition of Irish land were of more permanent importance than these shadowy State Trials; since the recommendations of both were of such a nature as to render it imperative on the Government to introduce a measure of Land Law Reform.

Parliament, at its meeting on the 6th of January, 1881, thus found itself charged with two heavy responsibilities, the suppression of crime, and the amendment of the law of landlord and tenant in Ireland. The Government naturally placed

coercion before reform, and thereby aroused a perfect storm of indignation in the Irish party below the gangway. For eleven nights the Debate on the Address was continued, the only theme being the condition of Ireland. This was an agreeable foretaste of the protracted sittings that would be necessary before the Government measures were forced through the House. Nothing, indeed, is more remarkable in the History of Parliament than the conflict which took place over the Coercion Bills. Twenty-one sittings (one lasting from Monday afternoon to Wednesday morning, forty-one and a half hours) were occupied in debating the Bill, of four clauses, for the Protection of Person and Property; and nine nights were devoted to the Peace Preservation Bill, which was almost equally short.

Absurdly protracted as these debates were, they might be still going on, except for the exercise of arbitrary power on the part of the Speaker; supported, it is true, by the leaders of both parties in the House. The abuse of freedom of speech led to the introduction of "urgency," whereby, in effect, the Prime Minister was constituted a Parliamentary Dictator. This was not carried without the most vehement protest on the part of the Irish Members, thirty-six of whom were, on one occasion, "named" as "disregarding the authority of the Chair," and forcibly removed from the House.

It is with pain that we recall these humiliating and disgraceful scenes; but they must necessarily be taken into account in considering the circumstances under which the remedial legislation of the Session was undertaken. These circumstances were fraught with evil augury for the success of Mr. Gladstone's measures of conciliation. The country was demoralised, the active Irish party in Parliament was defiant and dissatisfied. It was self-evident that no measure of justice which reasonable men could concede would satisfy the communistic cravings of the peasantry, or win over to loyal co-operation the minds of their representatives. Vast as were the benefits which it was proposed to confer, by the Land Bill, on the tenant-farmers of Ireland, it was instantly apparent that it would fail to satisfy their demands. Mr. Parnell declared that it gave nothing more than the Act of 1870, and characterized it as a "miserable dole," and a "half remedy." The Marquis of Hartington, in reply, openly charged him with desiring to defeat the Bill, in order that the agitation might continue.

With the Parliament history of the Bill itself we do not intend to deal. In the course of the discussion, which occupied forty-nine nights, some important Amendments were introduced; but the main principles of the Act, as it now stands on the Rolls of Parliament, are identical with those embodied in the Bill pre-

sented by Mr. Gladstone on the 7th of April. The subject that immediately concerns us is the effect of the measure, both proximate and remote; and, in order to form any judgment on this difficult question, it has been necessary to review, at some length, the social and political circumstances under which the Bill was introduced. At the risk of being tedious we shall recapitulate the principal features of this important crisis in the affairs of Ireland.

In the first place, the great mass of the tenants had repudiated their obligations, and resisted the payment of rent by an organized system of violence and intimidation. Secondly, the Land League had spread over the entire country, and assumed paramount authority over all dealings between landlords and tenants. Thirdly, Coercion Acts had been passed against the wishes of a large majority of the Irish members, and, after having been passed, were permitted to remain practically unused. Fourthly, the loyal classes were discouraged and discountenanced by the Government, whose inaction left them a prey to every form of social tyranny; in fact, the first object of the Land League—"to bring landlordism to its knees"—had been partially achieved; so far, at least, that the Land Bill received a more active support from that section of the community than from the class which it professed to benefit. Lastly, the small phalanx of Irish members who recognized Mr. Parnell's dictatorship, and, presumably, shared his views, looked with aversion on the proposed settlement of the tenants' grievances; because any settlement would cut the ground from under their feet, destroy the agitation, and indefinitely postpone the more ambitious project of national regeneration.

We must now briefly describe some of the principal changes effected by the Act, which are of course professedly in favour of the tenant. These will, we fear, sound somewhat revolutionary to the ears of English readers, accustomed as they are to consider property in land as standing on no exceptional footing, and conferring the same rights of disposition and ownership as the possession of a house in a town, or a purse full of gold pieces.

The Act of 1870 fell short of transferring to the tenant the actual property of any part of his holding; it merely gave him a liberal compensation both for "disturbance" and "improvements" when his occupancy was determined. The present Act—although it still shrinks from a legislative declaration of right—assumes the existence of a "tenancy" which is defined, in terms perhaps intentionally ambiguous, as "the interest in a holding of a tenant and his successors in title during the continuance of a *tenancy*." It is not a little remarkable that an expression, on which the operation of the Act principally depends, should be defined with such

slovenly carelessness as to include in the terms of the definition the very word which it is attempted to define. But there can be no doubt that, whatever the definition means, a valuable property is conferred on the tenant by the Act which may be sold, or bequeathed, or enjoyed in perpetuity by the tenant and his successors, if the "fair rent" fixed by the Commissioners is duly paid. No term of previous occupation is required; if a tenant-at-will was admitted on the 21st of August, the day before the Act received the Royal Assent, he became, in twenty-four hours, entitled to all the privileges of perpetual occupancy. This may be necessary and even just, having regard to the peculiar conditions of Irish land tenure; but it must be recognised at once as a very extraordinary limitation of the rights of property. Ejectment in the old sense of the word, *i.e.*, arbitrary, capricious resumption by the landlord of the tenant's farm, has been in recent years of rare occurrence; and the Act of 1870, by giving heavy compensation for "disturbance," made the game too expensive to be generally indulged in. Ejectment, however, for non-payment of rent, though unknown to the common law of England, does not seem in its nature at all unreasonable. No code founded on the civil law permits the hirer of land to retain possession unless he fulfils his part of the contract by paying the agreed stipend; and no attempt is made by the present Act to do away with this remedy. It, however, removes any hardship which was formerly associated with this remedy, by making it impossible for the landlord to impose an excessive rent on a "present tenant." The ejectments which figure so prominently in all recent discussions on Irish land tenure are actions founded on the non-payment of rent; and, in the majority of cases, they constitute the legal machinery for enforcing payment, without being pursued to the stage of actual eviction. Much misapprehension seems to prevail on this important point; and even Mr. Gladstone, who ought to possess some degree of familiarity with the subject, confounded *ejectment* with *eviction* when he described the former as a "sentence of death upon the Irish peasant." This "sentence of death" generally consists in a formal recovery of possession by the landlord when the tenant is reinstated either as a caretaker, or under a fresh agreement, without prejudice to his right of redemption on payment of arrears, interest and costs.

As to emphasize the creation of valuable tenant-right by the recent Act, its first section confers on the tenant the power of selling his "tenancy for the best price that can be got for the same;" a power, it must be observed, which he will be slow to exercise except in the last resort, and with a view to emigration. Its importance, however, is not to be estimated by the extent of its application. There is an unmistakable significance in

giving the place of honour to free sale of an undefined interest as indicating that every tenant, whether he has effected improvements or not, and whether his occupation has been long or short, is henceforward to be deemed a joint owner with his landlord. It amounts, in fact, to a practical extension of the Ulster custom to the rest of Ireland without the restrictions prevailing in the Northern province. The essential feature of the Ulster custom is the tenant's right of selling his interest, practically controlled within reasonable limits by the landlord's power of raising the rent. On some estates, indeed, the custom is more definite, and prescribes the maximum amount to be received by the tenant; but where this limit does not prevail, where the tenant can sell for the full competition value, and the landlord possesses the power of indefinitely raising the rent, there necessarily arises a conflict between these antagonistic rights. So long as the relations of landlord and tenant rested on mutual forbearance and good feeling no serious evil resulted from this theoretical imperfection; but now that they are placed, so to speak, at arm's length, the beneficial working of the custom is destroyed by the attempt to give it the force of law. Moreover, in its extension to other parts of Ireland by the first section of the late Act, the price of the tenant right will be practically uncontrolled, while by the subsequent sections the landlord's power of raising the rent is confined within rigid limits.

The next provision that it is necessary to notice is that contained in the sixth section. It deals with the subject of "Compensation for disturbance," and substitutes for the scale contained in the Act of 1870, one much more beneficial to the tenant. For example, seven years' rent may be granted by the Court to a tenant whose rent is under £30; whereas under the earlier Act, the seven years' allowance was limited to a £10 valuation. A corresponding liberality is shown throughout the scale, and the limit of £250, which was formerly placed on the amount of compensation, is now abrogated. As the former was, in practice, prohibitive, it may be assumed that henceforward we shall hear no more of capricious eviction. We now come to the cardinal provision of the Act—that which provides for the fixing of a Fair Rent. This, as will appear from the sequel, is the key of the position, round which the battle was most desperately contested and obstinately renewed. The difficulties, indeed, in the way of a satisfactory settlement were almost insuperable. Once the fatal economic step has been taken of interfering in matters of contract between man and man, there is nothing to check the progress of paternal control until it ends with the assize of bread and the fixing of labourers' wages.

To the test of competition, rent, like the elements on which its

calculation depends, must ultimately be brought. It is vain to reduce the rent of the "present" tenant if a dozen men are anxious to give him more than the capital value of the remitted rent as the price of his tenancy. The purchaser enters into occupation and has to pay—whether it is called rent or interest does not matter—more than his predecessor paid before the reduction. This is what makes the outlook so hopeless in Ireland, because to temperate, impartial, and far-seeing men the temporary nature of the relief is clear to demonstration. Let us now examine how Parliament has dealt with this problem. The first sub-section of the eighth section in its final form is as follows:—

The tenant of any present tenancy to which this Act applies, or such tenant and the landlord jointly, or the landlord, after having demanded from such tenant an increase of rent which the tenant has declined to accept, or after the parties have otherwise failed to come to an agreement, may, from time to time, during the continuance of such tenancy, apply to the Court to fix the fair rent to be paid by such tenant to the landlord for the holding, and thereupon the Court, after hearing the parties, and having regard to the interest of the landlord and tenant respectively, and considering all the circumstances of the case, holding, and district, may determine what is such fair rent?

This provision confers a certain privilege on "the tenant of a present tenancy to which this Act applies;" and we cannot, perhaps, more simply indicate the extent of its application than by enumerating those who are excluded from its benefits:—

(1.) Tenants holding leases—and these are supposed to amount to about 150,000—are, by Section 21, bound to conform to the terms of their agreements; but at the expiration of their leases they will become present tenants, and may apply to the Court under this Section. (2.) Future tenants are excluded altogether from this "fair rent" clause. Future tenancies, however, will be, for some time to come, of rare occurrence; for they can only arise when the landlord, at the passing of the Act, held the land in his own occupation; or, if there was at that date a subsisting tenancy, where the landlord recovers possession and re-lets after the 1st of January, 1883. If the landlord purchases the interest of a present tenant in exercise of his right of pre-emption, and re-lets within fifteen years, the new tenant is also, for some inscrutable reason, to be deemed a "present tenant." (3.) A numerous class of tenancies are also excluded from the operation of the Act by Section 58, on the ground that they do not give rise to the evils which it is intended to remedy. Such are, for example, tenancies which are not agricultural or pastoral in their character; demesne lands; town parks, pasture lands, lettings in con-acre, &c.

Subject to the foregoing limitations the great body of Irish

tenants are empowered by this Section to apply to the Court to fix a fair rent; and this judicial rent is to be incapable of alteration for fifteen years.

At the end of the statutory term the tenant can again apply to have his rent reduced, or may continue to hold from term to term, according to the statutory conditions. This is certainly Fixity of tenure at Fair rent; but there is this further precautionary provision, which is due to the astuteness of Mr. Healy, and is commonly known as "Healy's Clause":—

No rent shall be allowed or made payable in any proceedings under this Act in respect of improvements made by the tenant or his predecessors in title, and for which, in the opinion of the Court, the tenant or his predecessors in title shall not have been paid or otherwise compensated by the landlord or his predecessors in title.

There can be no doubt that natural justice revolts from the idea of an improving tenant being taxed for his industry. On some estates it is well known that if a tenant built a barn, or even showed signs of increased comfort, his rent was immediately raised. This, in our opinion, is odious tyranny and unjustifiable spoliation. Let us, however, calmly distinguish such cases from those of ordinary agricultural improvement; and in order to make our meaning clear we shall take the two simple cases of a tenant spending £100 in building a house, and the same sum in drainage. In the former case the increase in the value of the holding resulting from the expenditure can never be more than £100, and the tenant's interest in his improvements is represented at most by that sum. But in the case of drainage (and the same reasoning applies to every species of agricultural improvement) £100 may turn twenty acres of land, practically valueless, into a farm worth £20 or £30 per annum, the selling value being increased by four or five times the amount of the judicious expenditure. Now, whence does this increased value proceed? The answer is obvious: partly from the money expended by the tenant, partly from the inherent qualities of the soil. And it would seem only equitable that the owner of the soil should have some share in the development of its potential powers. Nature, finely apostrophized by Chaucer as—

The Vicar of the Almighty Lord,

works hand in hand with man, and sometimes repays tenfold a slight expenditure of effort. We are not in favour of confiscating the results of toil and energy, but we wish to point out the difference between those improvements which a man *creates*, and those which *result* incidentally from his labour. The former are his, and his alone; the latter should be attributed partly to him and partly to the owner of the land.

The Act, besides the provisions already referred to, contains many others which may eventually prove highly beneficial to the tenants, especially those relating to the purchase of their holdings and the reclamation of land. Advances of public money for these purposes are authorized to be made to the tenants on liberal terms; but it seems doubtful whether the fascination of ownership will in many cases outweigh the temporary burthen of an increased annual charge. The public purse is also rendered available for the promotion of emigration and the payment of arrears of rent. The former scheme seems thoroughly unpractical, and the latter is so fettered by conditions that it will not, we think, furnish a solution of that very difficult problem.

On the 22nd of August the Bill received the Royal Assent, and as some months should necessarily elapse before the Commission could enter on its duties, a clause had been inserted by which it was provided that any application made to the Court on the occasion of its first sitting should have the same operation as if made on the day when the Act came into force. As "the Court" includes both the Civil Bill Court and the Land Commission, there may be some difficulty in holding that where a tenant allowed his Quarter Sessions to pass by without making application, and afterwards applied to the Land Commission, he was entitled to claim the benefit of this Section. Assuming, however, that this point is decided in his favour, the retrospective effect of the Section enables any evicted tenant, whose period of redemption had not expired on the 22nd of August, to apply to the Court for a judicial rent, and it also holds out a bait for early applications by ante-dating the order for a reduction of rent.

The foregoing sketch of the provisions of the Act is far from being complete. There are many subjects comprised in its sixty-two sections on which we should desire to dwell more at large; but since the present interest is fully absorbed by the question of the settlement of judicial rents, and the working of the Courts is practically confined to that topic, we shall not allude further to subjects of minor importance, but pass directly to the consideration of events subsequent to the passing of the Act.

In most agricultural communities the grant of such a charter would have been hailed with vehement demonstrations of joy and gratitude. Ireland, not usually backward in shouting or bonfires, received the gift in sullen silence. Under ordinary circumstances, we feel sure that the country, from one end to the other, would have been kindled with enthusiasm; but the discipline of the Land League had become so perfect that the farmers dared not express their opinions except at the dictation of the local branch. It was not long before the order from head quarters as to the reception of the Act was circulated through

the country. The *mot d'ordre* beyond question was, that no one should appeal to the Court without the express sanction of the League. Mr. Parnell had determined to discredit the Land Bill and keep the agitation alive; and, above all, to prohibit any individual action on the part of the tenants in appealing to the Court for a selfish settlement of isolated cases.

Shortly after the prorogation of Parliament, the vacancy in the representation of Tyrone, caused by the promotion of Mr. Lytton to a Commissionership under the Act, afforded to Mr. Parnell an opportunity of attacking the Government, and making repeated declarations of his future policy. The Home Rule candidate was at the bottom of the poll, and did not even divide the Liberal vote to such an extent as to secure the return of a Tory. Still, Mr. Parnell was probably well satisfied with the result of his campaign, since it enabled him to publish to the world the views expressed in the following extracts:—

Within the last eighteen months the Land League had gained the farmers 20 per cent. reduction, and in the next year they would obtain 20 per cent. more; but even that would only bring rents to the proper basis to enable the landlords to be bought out.

After frankly confessing that he and his party were endeavouring to root the landlords out of the land, he continued:—

Irish landlordism was one of the principal props of English misrule in Ireland. Well, we have nearly cut and hacked that prop in two; and before many months have gone by, I think we shall have cut it away altogether.

With much more in the same violent strain; and on a subsequent occasion he said:—

The great principle of the Land League was that the land of Ireland did not, and ought not, to belong to the landlords, but to the people; and in order to carry out that principle as far as it was possible, they offered to the landlords a compromise in order to obtain a peaceable solution of the question. They offered to give them whatever value they could prove the land of Ireland had when the waters of the Flood left it! And if they could carry out that programme—and they had partially carried it out by the Bill just passed—they would reduce the rental of Ireland from 17 millions to about two or three millions a year.

We have here a distinct and settled policy on the lines which we attributed to Mr. Parnell at the commencement of this article—the abolition of landlordism as means to a national end; and Mr. Parnell's motive in discrediting the Land Bill and keeping up the agitation will now be clear—almost to his dupes. He feared that the vast concessions made to the tenants by the measure would have the effect of tranquillizing the country,

stifling the agitation, and "rooting the landlords in the soil;" thereby undoing the labour of years, and indefinitely postponing the separate national existence of Ireland. He was too astute, however, to oppose his influence directly to the working of the Land Bill. The tactics which he adopted were at once to influence the imaginations of the farmers with hopes of fresh conquests; and, by the sedulous propagation of false principle, to render them dissatisfied with the actual benefits conferred upon them. With this object he undertook the preparation of "test cases," carefully selected, for the moderation of the rents, so that when the Court, as he expected, refused to make any reduction, he might appeal to the platform agitation with some proof of disappointed expectations. With the same purpose, and also to show the unanimity of Ireland, he called together the National Convention, which met in Dublin on the 15th September, and which endorsed his policy and obeyed his will in a very remarkable manner.

This assemblage of 1,500 delegates from every branch of the Land League was one of the most significant proofs, if proofs were wanting, of the universal sway which the League exercised over the country, and the total subserviency of the League itself to the authority of a master mind. For three days this monster parliament, we cannot say debated, for they were all of one mind, but delivered speeches on the Land Act, the programme of their future action, and the resolutions which had been presented for their adoption; and during those three days this heterogeneous assembly was controlled and directed by its president as perfectly as a docile steed by the delicate hand of his mistress.

The crownless harp and the stars and stripes adorned the hall in which they met, and these emblems of the dead Ireland of their ancestors and of the land of their adoption, fittingly symbolized their yearnings for the past and their hopes in the future. With the present no one had the hardihood to express even a qualified contentment; and the monotonous burthen of every speech was agitation, disloyalty, and dismemberment. These were indeed the texts on which they spoke, as is apparent from the resolutions which were submitted for their nominal consideration, the first and third of which were as follows:—

1st. That this National Convention, assembled by the will of the people of Ireland, and acting in their name, declares at the outset of its proceedings, that the cause of the political and social evils which afflict and impoverish our country, is to be found in the detestable system of alien rule, so injurious and oppressive to our people; and that this Convention solemnly declares its full conviction that Ireland can never be either prosperous or content until her people enjoy the right of national self-government—a right which

they never forfeited and never abandoned, and for the restoration of which they will never cease to struggle with all their power. 3rd. That this Convention, standing by the original programme and fundamental purpose of the Land League, declares that no settlement of the land question can be satisfactorily effective or practicable which does not abolish landlordism root and branch, and make the tiller also the owner of the soil. That the Land Act, proceeding from the opposite principle of maintaining a joint proprietorship of landlord and tenant in the land, cannot be accepted as a just or a wise, and still less a final settlement of the question, and that its radical insufficiency and many defects prevent it from being regarded as even a temporary remedy of a satisfactory character. That this Convention solemnly pledges itself accordingly to a determined adherence to the principles of the Land League till all its aims have been fully accomplished, and binds itself to maintain the same solid combination against landlordism which has worked such magnificent results in the last two years.

In this declamatory verbiage there is evidence of a settled design to resist the Land Act, and to continue the agitation; and, as these resolutions were accepted by 1,500 representative delegates from all parts of Ireland, it is not surprising that the renewal of the platform campaign met with an enthusiastic reception. In vain did the Irish Bishops, assembled at Maynooth, declare to the people of Ireland "that the new Land Act is a great benefit to the tenant class, and a large instalment of justice, for which the gratitude of the country is due to Mr. Gladstone and his Government;" in vain did they earnestly exhort their flocks "to avail themselves of the advantages derivable from this Act." The power of the political organization, the county convention, the Sunday platform, counteracted their beneficent intentions. The active forces of lawlessness assumed a new vigour. Every form of violence and intimidation was now directed against the operation of the Act, as they had been against the payment of rent. "Boycotting" spread to such an extent that, in the county of Roscommon alone, more than 400 cases of this intolerable persecution had been reported to the authorities. The Act intended for the benefit of the tenant-farmers of Ireland evoked, at the beck of "the leader of the Irish people," more hostility than was ever shown to the most stringent measure of coercion. Under the influence of an unhealthy frenzy, the largest measure of reform ever offered to any community was ignominiously spurned. The lines of Wordsworth were prophetic in their description of

The exasperated spirit of that Land
Which turned an angry beak against the down

Of its own breast, as if it hoped thereby
To disencumber its impatient wings.*

Was it to be endured that an irresponsible demagogue and a tyrannical association should stand between the people and the gifts which were offered to them? The Ministers and Parliament had devoted incessant and untiring energies to framing this Message of Peace; and now it seemed that, by the factious interference of a seditious organization, it was to be rejected untried. Mr. Gladstone, however, is a dangerous man to cross; and we have no doubt that it was with well-matured plans that he went down to Leeds, in his own words, "to speak plainly and explicitly on the subject of Ireland." In that great centre of Liberal opinion, he foreshadowed the action of the Government in the following sentences:—

We are determined that no force, and no fear of force, and no fear of ruin through force, shall, so far as we are concerned, and as it is in our power to decide the question, prevent the Irish people from having the full and free benefit of the Land Act. And if, when we have that short further experience to which I have referred, if it should then appear that there is still to be fought the final conflict in Ireland between law on the one side and sheer lawlessness upon the other; if the law, purged from defect and from any taint of injustice, is still to be refused, and the first condition of political society to remain unfulfilled,—then I say, gentlemen, without hesitation, *that the resources of civilization are not yet exhausted.* (Cheers.)

The solemnity of this warning must have been sadly marred for those who remembered the mocking words of Biglow:—

Is our civilization a failure,
And is the Caucasian played out?

And the Tory orators found much food for merriment in the "resources of civilization." By the Irish party, however, the seriousness of the crisis seems to have been intuitively grasped. Mr. Parnell, far from being daunted by the imminence of the combat, flung down his gage of battle with unconquerable spirit. At Wexford, on the following Sunday, he answered Mr. Gladstone's pronouncement with his usual violence, and more than his usual ability. He seized on the admission that the Government had "no moral force behind it," as a proof that English rule was a miserable failure. He dwelt on the inconsistencies of Mr. Gladstone in conceding the Act of 1881; and twitted him with his politeness to the Boers when he found out the quality of their marksmanship. Both in vituperation and

* Wordsworth's "Excursion," Book iii.

logic the victory seemed to rest with the Land Leaguer; but Mr. Gladstone was ready with a reply for which no one, least of all the member for Cork, was at all prepared. On the 13th of October, within a week of the speech at Leeds, Mr. Parnell was arrested under the Coercion Act, and lodged in Kilmainham Gaol. No event within the memory of the present generation created so profound a sensation as this unceremonious dealing with "the uncrowned king of Ireland." His quondam subjects had come to regard him as too powerful to be touched by the British Government, a feeling justified, perhaps, by the immunity which he had hitherto enjoyed. His immediate followers did not hesitate to ascribe the action of the Prime Minister to personal animosity and mortified vanity; and if such a charge could be sustained, we should join in condemning the abuse of political power in avenging private insult. Without, however, going so far as to deny that the Wexford speech hastened the catastrophe, we should be sorry to attribute to base personal motives what is perfectly explicable as a political necessity. Mr. Gladstone's answer to the imputation, had he condescended to make one, might have been to this effect:—"The Land Act is a Message of Peace, which will work incalculable benefits for the Irish tenants. Mr. Parnell stands between the people and the Land Act; therefore Mr. Parnell must be removed"—a train of reasoning fully justified by subsequent events. It is a pity, however, that the "reasonable suspicions" of the Chief Secretary could not have been aroused as to some less shadowy crime than that described in the following curious language:—

Inciting other persons, wrongfully and without legal authority, to intimidate divers persons with a view to compel them to abstain from doing what they had a legal right to do—namely, to pay rents lawfully due by them.

Yet this was the crime charged in the warrant under which Mr. Parnell was arrested; and on Mr. Forster's "suspicion" that this formidable offence had been committed the liberties of Her Majesty's subjects were made to depend. Necessary as we believe the arrest to have been, and approved, as it undoubtedly was, by the voice of public opinion in England, we cannot ignore the fact that it signalized the utter collapse of constitutional government in Ireland. Other arrests, scarcely less important, followed in quick succession. Mr. Sexton, M.P., and the Secretary of the Land League, joined their President the next day, and Messrs. O'Kelly and Dillon the day after. Mr. Healy was stopped at Holyhead just as he was about to put his head in the Lion's Mouth; and a warrant was perambulating Dublin in search of Mr. O'Connor, who was saved by being on a visit of condolence

to his chief in Kilmainham, where the officers never dreamt of looking for him—an incident which reminds us forcibly of a remark of a witty Irish judge on the Connaught Circuit, who said that the only place in Mayo where life and property were safe was in the dock at Castlebar! Proclamations and arrests followed fast and furious; meetings were prohibited or dispersed; Mr. Forster's mind seemed suddenly to have assumed a condition of chronic suspicion, and the Executive showed by their activity a firm determination to annihilate the Land League. The expiring effort of that body took the shape of the remarkable "No Rent Manifesto," which was signed by the principal "suspects" in Kilmainham, and was addressed to the Irish people. With the solemnity of a death-bed exhortation the executive of the Land League warned "the tenant farmers of Ireland from this time forth to pay no rents under any circumstances to their landlords, until the Government relinquishes the existing system of terrorism, and restores the constitutional rights of the people." It supplied the Government with precisely what they wanted, an authoritative declaration, on the part of the Land League, of its illegal aims; and justified the proclamation of the 20th of October, which declared the Irish National Land League to be an illegal and criminal association, and warned all subjects of Her Majesty to disconnect themselves therefrom. In the meantime the effect on the country of these repressive measures was anything but hopeful. Riots in Dublin, riots in Limerick, anarchy and confusion everywhere: sullen resistance to law; open and seemingly universal sympathy with the victims of arbitrary government! The shopkeepers put up their shutters, the houses displayed mourning emblems, and various public bodies vied with each other in condemning the arrests, and expressing approval of the principles of the League.

It was under these painful circumstances that the Irish Land Commission entered on its labours; and we cannot but commiserate the trying position in which it was placed, as the administrator of a great popular measure in the face of a great popular tumult. There can be little doubt that both the Commissioners and Sub-Commissioners were affected by the attitude of the country, and by the knowledge that if rents were not substantially reduced so as to satisfy the demands of the tenants, their Court would be flouted as the Civil Bill Courts had been before. Their jurisdiction was founded, not on abstract right, but on conciliation, and their first duty was to justify their own appointment, and ensure the success of the Land Act.

By a coincidence which cannot be ascribed entirely to chance, the Court of the Land Commission was opened in Dublin on the

very day on which the Land League was proclaimed; and Mr. Justice O'Hagan, in an eloquent address, manifestly intended as a bid for custom, explained to the farmers all the advantages placed within their reach. He defined a "fair rent" to be "that which might be fairly paid, and yet permit a tenant, not deficient in those qualities of industry and providence which are expected in any walk of life, to live and thrive." This definition spread through the country like wildfire, and excited vague expectations of an agricultural millennium. The conditions of "industry" and "providence" were ignored or forgotten, while the "live-and-thrive" doctrine was accepted as the standard of the new Court. A general impression was produced in the minds of the tenants that, no matter what was the size of their farms or the quality of their land, they were somehow to be raised to a condition of ease and comfort. This was, of course, a delusion; but it was a delusion which brought the tenants flocking into the Court that they might "live and thrive." On the first days of the sitting there was scarcely any business to be done. A few formal applications being disposed of the Court generally rose, after a couple of hours, although the "first occasion," originally limited to eight days, but subsequently extended to the 12th of November, offered exceptional advantages to the applicant. There had been no lack of advertisement, and the Commissioners had even taken the somewhat questionable step of circulating, in a popular form, a summary of the provisions of the Act, calling attention to the benefits conferred on the tenants. Still, two months had elapsed since the measure had received the Royal Assent, the "first occasion," as originally fixed, had almost expired, and only some 2,000 of the 600,000 tenants of Ireland had shewn any intention of availing themselves of the Act. This apathy, however, was replaced by activity when it became apparent how the word "fair" was to be interpreted by the Court. Instead of perishing through inanition, it was threatened with fatal repletion. "Originating Notices" poured in by thousands, and after the first actual decisions of the Sub-Commissioners, the eagerness of the tenants was further stimulated. So tremendous, indeed, was the rush at the last moment, that on the 12th of November the three Commissioners were obliged to sit separately for thirteen hours to "record" notices for the fixing of rents. It was midnight before they desisted from their labours, and they had then accomplished the feat of formally recording upwards of 12,000 applications, which brought the total number received since the opening of the Court to upwards of 42,000.

This preliminary success, achieved by the suppression of the Land League and the liberal interpretation of the Act, was in itself a source of embarrassment. A vast number of cases had

been recorded, but the actual work of determining the rent remained to be done. What machinery was available for this Herculean task, and what hope could be entertained of speedy performance? The examination of witnesses, and inspection of farms in 40,000 cases (the number has since been enlarged to more than 50,000), would necessarily occupy the existing Sub-Commissioners for years to come; and in the meantime the relations between the parties to these untried actions must continue to be of a most unsatisfactory character. There is, indeed, reason to believe that, in a large number of instances, originating notices have been served by the tenants for the mere purpose of gaining time. The difficulty may be partially met by increasing the number of Sub-Commissioners; but it is doubtful how far competent persons can be secured for this temporary and disagreeable duty. It was hoped also that, after the decision of a few cases, voluntary settlements out of Court would be generally resorted to; but this expectation has not been extensively realized. In many towns the great majority of the cases "listed" have been postponed, so as to enable the Sub-Commissioners to keep their appointments at the next town of their circuit. The great pressure of business is also attended with this danger, that the important work of valuation may be performed in a hasty and perfunctory manner. The most serious aspect, however, of indefinite postponement is presented by its unfavourable influence on the social problem. If Ireland is to be pacified by the Land Act, the result can only be attained when the acrimonious process of litigation shall have come to an end, and of this there seems at present but a remote prospect.

The work of the Land Commission in Dublin has been hitherto of an uninteresting and technical description. The three Commissioners have been chiefly employed in determining whether, in particular cases, there was a "subsisting tenancy," in ordering substituted service, in extending the tenant's time for redemption, and in the ministerial duty of recording applications. We shall therefore pass to the Courts of the Sub-Commissioners, as the centres of paramount interest, where the subject of "fair rent" received its practical exposition.

On the last day of October two district Courts commenced their sittings—one for the north-east in Belfast, the other for the north-west at Castleblayney, in the county of Monaghan. It is with the latter that we are for the moment more immediately concerned, as to this Court belongs the distinction of having given the first judgment under the new Act. It was a case important in itself as exposing some of the worst evils of Irish land tenure; but still more important as a revelation of the views of Sub-Commissioners on the subject of fair rent. The procedure of

these Courts is so uniform that a description of this case will serve as an example of the method generally adopted.

Patrick M'Atavey, the tenant, was until recently a railway porter in Manchester, his wife working the farm, assisted by occasional remittances from her husband. The landlord was also an absentee, the management of the estate being conducted through an "office." The farm in question consisted of 10a. 1r. 38p. of poor land, held at a rent of £8 16s. 2d., the Poor Law valuation being £6. The north-western Sub-Commission devoted the greater part of two days to the hearing of this case, in which they ultimately reduced the rent to £6 6s., which differed by only a few shillings from the valuation. After the solicitor for the claimant had opened the case in a discursive speech, treating of the history of the farm, and the antecedents of the M'Ataveys for several generations, evidence was called on the part of the tenant to show that the present rent was excessive. This consisted of the testimony of a professional valuer, who had five years before given a fraudulent valuation to the "Office," and that of neighbouring farmers, who will no doubt expect reciprocal action on the part of M'Atavey, when it is their turn to be plaintiffs. The tenant himself then deposed that he "could not live as he did abroad and pay the rent," that he had only a profit of 7s. 4½d. on one field of corn, that he had been forced to sign an agreement ousting the Ulster custom, &c. The landlord's rebutting evidence was then entered into, from which it appeared that the claimant had refused £100 for his interest, or nearly twelve years' purchase of his "exorbitant" rent! The next day the Commissioners drove six miles to make a personal inspection of the farm, and on their return heard more evidence; and finally pronounced the decision which we have already mentioned, without giving any reasons, or alluding to the principles on which their judgment was founded. It may be mentioned that the announcement of the judicial rent was greeted with applause, and that a band paraded the streets in celebration of the popular victory; and also that the Government valuation, to which the rent was practically reduced, had included a part only of the holding in question—a fact which seems to have transpired only after the judgment had been pronounced. We have dwelt in detail on this case, not only for the purpose of indicating the *modus operandi* of the Sub-Commission Courts, but also to show how perfectly uncontrolled the Sub-Commissioners seem to be in the exercise of their discretion. An appeal nominally lies to the head Commission in Dublin, but no materials exist in such a judgment on which it is capable of review. So long as the legal Sub-Commissioner abstains from principles, and the agricultural members of the Court from figures, their position

would seem to be impregnable. Lord Campbell once advised an incompetent Indian judge to give no reasons for his judgments, for that his judgments might be right, but his reasons would be sure to be wrong. We wish that we could come to the conclusion that the judgments of the Sub-Commissioners "might be right," for the uniform course of their decisions, in all parts of the country, and under all circumstances, points to a settled determination to bring rents down to the level of the popular demands.

The same occult principle which guided the north-western Sub-Commission to a reduction of M'Atavey's rent by 25 per cent., also inspired the Belfast Court in the decision of their cases. The rents of fifteen tenants of Mr. Crawford, although, according to Professor Baldwin, "many of the farms were in a neglected, and a few in a shameful state," were reduced in the same proportion, the former rental of £640 17s. 4d. being now represented by "judicial rents" amounting to £472 14s. 6d., while the Government valuation of the fifteen farms is £446 1s. The deterioration of the land which the tenants allowed in these cases ought of itself to have disqualified them from obtaining relief, the neglect being the more inexcusable as their farms were above the average size of holdings in Ireland. It is one-sided justice that gives the value of improvements to the tenant, and throws the loss through deterioration on the landlord. Neglect and bad farming are too often sufficiently manifest; the "improvements," however, are occasionally of a somewhat visionary character. For example, among the recent claims under this head we find "putting on a new roof in the year 1841," "digging up the drains made by the landlord;" while one ingenious fellow, having erected a new "slated" house, "top-dressed the land with the old mud cabin."

On the 8th of November, two new Sub-Commissions opened Courts at Limerick and Claremorris, and it was quickly apparent that the Ulster reductions would be fully maintained in the south and west. In the first case at Limerick the rent was exactly halved; although there was no evidence of a recent increase, there were no improvements, the land had been continuously meadowed for twenty years without ever being manured, and the landlord and tenant "were equally apathetic and unimproving." But there is no use in multiplying instances. The fact of a universal reduction is admitted; and, unless we could produce the secret instructions of the Sub-Commissioners, we should be unable to prove that the close approximation of the judicial rent to Griffiths' valuation was in some hundreds of cases anything more than a coincidence. It may, however, be of interest to our readers to compare the total reductions, in a large

number of cases taken from the several districts. We must exclude the four Sub-Commissions recently appointed for Donegal, Tyrone, Sligo, and Kerry, since their decisions are not as yet sufficiently numerous to furnish us with materials. Taking thirty-five cases from each of the older Sub-Commissions the results will be seen by a glance at the following table:—

	Valuation:	Old Rent.	Judicial Rent.	Reduction.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
North-east . .	782 12 0	1,095 9 7	815 17 6	279 12 2
North-west . .	381 4 0	450 12 2	373 6 4	77 5 10
South	892 12 1	1,422 8 7	1,112 15 0	309 13 7
West	213 1 1	324 9 11	199 9 7	125 0 4

There are several very significant facts brought into prominence by the foregoing figures, the first of which is the practical uniformity of the reduction. The bog land of Mayo and the golden vale of Limerick are subjected to very similar treatment. Next we have to notice the vast difference, in value and rent, between the holdings in the west and north-west, and those in the north-east and south. The average judicial rent payable by the thirty-five Connaught tenants amounts only to £6, while in Limerick (South) it stands at more than five times that sum. The most remarkable circumstance which attracts our attention is, however, the close agreement of the figures in the first and third columns. If we set aside the southern Commission, whose cases were in many respects peculiar, notably from including the market gardens of Limerick, we find a quite remarkable coincidence between the valuation and the judicial rent. For the thirty-five cases in each of the three districts, North-east, North-west, and West, making 105 cases in all, the valuation amounts to £1,376 17s. 1d., and the judicial rent has been fixed at £1,388 13s. 5d. Now the cases are not selected, they are taken in the order of decision; those only being neglected in which the particulars were not completely furnished. This extraordinary agreement of the judicial rent with Griffiths' valuation would be a singular proof of the accuracy of both valuations if they had been made under similar circumstances; but we need only refer to Professor Baldwin's remarks on Griffiths' valuation, reported in the *Freeman's Journal* of the 1st of December, in confirmation of what is well known, that agricultural conditions have been entirely changed, and that the earlier valuation is now no test whatever of the present letting value of land. The conclusion which we are forced to adopt is that the present valuation by the Sub-

Commissioners is in the main determined by the figures of the earlier valuation. This, unfortunately, corresponds with the aspirations of the tenants at the beginning of the rent agitation. The most charitable hypothesis which we can suggest in explanation of this coincidence is, that the Sub-Commissioners adopted a standard of "fair rent" considerably below the mercantile value of the land; and there is nothing in the Act to prevent their doing so. But if that is the case, and their grounds of decision are not unlikely to be subjected to Parliamentary inquiry, it raises an unanswerable claim on the part of the landlords to reasonable compensation in respect of the difference.*

If the rents of the struggling farmers on ten or twenty acres of poor land had been exceptionally treated, we should have assented to the natural conclusion that they had been grievously rack-rented; but where we find "strong" farmers, whose rents were £100 and upwards, and who are presumably above the influence of landlord domination, applying to the Court and receiving reductions of twenty and thirty per cent., we are compelled to recognize the working of a predetermined system. It would be easy, if we were so inclined, to adduce examples of manifest injustice in the decisions of the several Sub-Commissions; but we are not here concerned with the consideration of individual injuries. Our aim has been, and we have endeavoured, to perform our duty without partiality, to present to our readers in a general view the administration of the Courts as they bear upon the relations of landlord and tenant. The result of this administration has been, so far, to interpret the Act with easy generosity in favour of the Irish tenants. Large gifts have been bestowed upon them to inaugurate and popularize the new system; but hitherto without any appreciable effect on the angry spirit of the country. It is, perhaps, too soon to expect the beneficial results of the measure to become apparent. A few short months are not sufficient to test the operation of a great measure of social reform; and there may be persons who still hope that the peasantry will ultimately abandon agitation, make the most of the Land Act, and acquire habits of industry and thrift. These blessings certainly lie within their reach, and it is with feelings of despair that we see, day by day, fresh proofs of their determination to reject them. The

* The following observations were made by one of the Sub-Commissioners at Downpatrick on the 15th of December:—"I now say, in the presence of my colleagues, that the principles on which we have proceeded in determining a fair rent, were laid down before we set our feet on a sod of land, and before we commenced our labours in the Court House, Belfast, and that they have not been deviated from a hair's breadth." Before reading this singularly naïve utterance, we had arrived at the same conclusion from the study of the actual decisions.

times are critical; if the reformation is not swiftly made, it will become more and more difficult. The choice of branching roads—to revert to the illustration with which we commenced—is a final step, and determines with inexorable certainty the ultimate destination of the people. Can nothing further be done to direct them into the path which leads to peace, contentment, and prosperity? The choice has, we fear, been already made, and some fatal steps taken on the track that knows no returning footsteps. Humanly speaking, society is incapable of sudden conversion. The anarchy and confusion of one year are linked to the slumbering discontent of the past by natural causes, as certain as those which connect the thunderstorm with the tropical heat which precedes it.

The prospect is, we must admit, gloomy in the extreme. Let us glance for a moment at the actual state of society in Ireland. The two classes which constitute the bulk of the population confront each other in a deadly conflict. All the kindly relations which are the groundwork of civil society are extinct. An army of police and military cannot maintain the semblance of order. Coercion cannot subdue or conciliation pacify the “exasperated spirit of the land.” Murders and outrages of the most detestable character follow each other in swift succession, and the malefactors who commit them walk abroad in open day unpunished though not unknown.* One of the most savage and cowardly murders which the annals of agrarian crime, even in Ireland, can furnish, was perpetrated within the last few days near Rathdowney, in the Queen’s County. Its circumstances illustrate so fully the remarks which we have just made that we need not apologize to our readers for describing its fearful details. A poor man of the name of Martin Rogers was induced by the extremity of distress to undertake the service of writs on the tenants of Mr. Whitley, at Graigue Ganon, in the Queen’s County. He had but one hand, and was in bad health, and was glad of an opportunity to earn a little money even at the hazard of his life. Having reached Rathdowney, he lodged his writs with the constabulary for safe custody, and the next day, rashly declining all protection, went alone to execute them. He served three, apparently without molestation, but on his way to the fourth house, he was set upon in a deep lane and pounded to death with

* It must be observed that during the recent Winter Assizes, juries, even in agrarian cases, have performed their duties in a more satisfactory manner than has been the rule for some years. In a large number of cases, convictions were obtained by the Crown; and, in general, the acquittals and disagreements were, if not justifiable, at least capable of explanation, without resorting to the painful solution of a universal conspiracy against law and order.

stones. No pity for a one-armed man found a place in the hearts of the murderers. Humanity was cancelled in their breasts by his violation of the agrarian law, and they took his life with as little compunction as if he were some noxious reptile. There is no reason to suppose that the perpetrators of this foul deed were better or worse than the great mass of their fellows. That they were no hired bravoos or professional murderers is perfectly clear, but simply some of the inhabitants of the townland who considered themselves grievously outraged by the service of legal process. The agent of an estate in the County Clare recently called on the tenantry to pay their rents on a certain day. Only three responded to the summons, when the following colloquy is reported to have taken place. "Have you brought the rent? Yes. Will you pay? No. Will you pay any rent. No. Will you go to the Court and have a fair rent fixed? No." Yet the houses of these three men were fired into that night to warn them against holding communication with the enemy.

A more ghastly story is told by the agent of Lord Kenmare in the *Times* of the 7th of December. Three of the tenants were rash enough to pay their rents. Their punishment followed, as a matter of course, and in a form so savage as to suggest the idea that the country is reverting to barbarism. A crowd assembled, and with fifes and drums marched to the houses of the condemned men. They were successively led forth, and, in the presence of their families, two of them were shot through the legs; while one, whether from accident or design, received the charge in a vital part of his body.

These dismal narratives give some idea of the quality of the crime which disgraces the country, and of the unrelenting fury with which the peasants pursue those who disobey the edicts of the Land League. For the deplorable extent to which such outrages prevail, we must refer to the Return of Agrarian Outrages published in the *Dublin Gazette*, and to the charge of Mr. Justice Fitzgerald to the grand jury of the winter assizes at Cork. The returns in the *Gazette* give a total of 520 agrarian crimes reported to the police in the month of November, the corresponding number last year having been 561. There is here a slight decrease, but it is, unfortunately, more apparent than real, because in all the more serious forms of crime there is a marked increase; while the diminution in the number of threatening letters and milder methods of intimidation must be ascribed to the practical abandonment of legal rights.

Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, whose charge twelve months ago on the same circuit created a profound sensation, drew a mournful picture of the state of society in the four counties—Cork, Limerick, Kerry, and Clare—comprised in the winter assizes

over which he presided. We need not follow him through the details of crime which disgraced these counties during the preceding four months. It must suffice to state, that in every county there was a considerable increase on the figures which he commented on last year, the gross result being 1,062 indictable offences, compared with 606 in the corresponding period of 1880. After carefully analyzing the returns presented to him, he continued :—

The general deduction from the statistics which I have laid before you seems to be, that in many and large parts of the four counties which constitute the Munster Winter Assizes Commission, life continues to be insecure, or is rendered so miserable as to be worthless. Right is disregarded, property is unsafe, and the spirit of lawlessness and disorder, marked by an insolent defiance of law and authority, continues to prevail. It is only by the aid of an overwhelming military force that the process of the law can be executed. The humbler classes continue to be oppressed by an odious tyranny.

He asserted that the list of outrages which he had before him revealed a state of things which, "if suffered to continue unchecked and unrepressed, threatens the very existence of the fabric of society." After referring to a passage in his charge of the year before, in which he had said that all well-thinking persons were ready to make any sacrifice if, by so doing, they could restore peace and prosperity, he continued :—

The sacrifice has since been made and consummated by the Legislature in a measure so large and unprecedented, that even the most sanguine advocate of tenant-right could not have anticipated it twelvemonths ago. But has the public obtained the fruits in the restoration of peace and order? Certainly not in Munster.

These records are sufficiently disheartening; but no statistics can adequately represent the change which has come over the spirit of the people. The devotional reverence of the Irish, and their childlike affection for their pastors, used to be proverbial. The altar was sacred; the voice of the priest was listened to with equal attention in counsel or condemnation. Now, this seems to be changed. If a Pastoral excites disapprobation, if the father of his flock warns them against erroneous courses, they resent it in a manner which would be scarcely decent in an ordinary meeting. Forgetful alike of the sanctity of the place, and the duty which they owe to their spiritual fathers, they rush from the Church, or drown the voice of the preacher in a chorus of irreverent noises. We trust that such occurrences are rare, and that the Irish people have not, in general, so far forgotten their traditions of piety as to

suffer what they deem their temporal interests to outweigh the sanctions of religion. Still, such incidents as we have alluded to are full of significance, and may be the first fatal indications of that communistic spirit which has for some years been so zealously inculcated.

What remedy remains to be tried? What further resource of civilization, whether in the direction of conciliation or repression, has the English Government in reserve?—or will they, having tried simultaneously what we consider mutually destructive remedies, abandon the struggle, and calmly wait for the catastrophe? Their position at present resembles that of two men in a boat, pulling in opposite directions: the boat goes round and round, and meanwhile drifts to the falls. A Select Committee of the House of Lords recommends the partial suspension of trial by jury; a section of the newspaper press clamours for martial law; and the Solicitor General of the late Government suggests the trial of Irish murder cases at the Old Bailey. Not one of these proposals approaches the real difficulty, the deep-seated evil which threatens the existence of society. The most conscientious jury in the world cannot convict without evidence, and a drum-head court-martial is scarcely an appropriate tribunal for enforcing the payment of rent. The perpetrators of many outrages are widely known, yet no one will come forward to denounce the criminals. The population of the district thus become the accomplices of every local crime, and the first step towards the suppression of such crime would seem to be to render it locally unpopular. Now all the agrarian outrages in Ireland spring from one very simple and very sordid cause, cupidity. In their cupidity, therefore, should the peasantry be punished for the crimes which it incites and protects. Whenever an agrarian murder, or injury to property, took place under circumstances from which it might be inferred that the criminals were shielded by the people, the townland should be heavily fined, and compensation made to the relatives, or to the injured person. We do not pretend that this would effect a rapid, or even a very general improvement: all that we venture to hope for is, that some such measure would have a tendency to enrol increasing numbers in the army of order.

The situation is indeed most embarrassing, and its difficulties have been increased tenfold by two mistakes. The first consisted in the weakness of conceding the Land Bill to agitation and outrage; the second in attempting to combine conciliation with coercion. Any further concession, especially in the direction of separate legislation, would be regarded in Ireland as a virtual abandonment of the Union; while the repression of crime by Act of Parliament seems utterly hopeless.

What is, then, to be the end? The problem will, we fear, work itself out, and quickly too, if the Government is unable to cope with the social disorders of the country. The Land League, although nominally suppressed, is winning a slow but certain victory. The gentry are being driven from the country, many of them ruined. The Land Courts and the No-rent Manifesto are working together to extinguish landlordism; and what then? Let us suppose that rents have been abolished, and that the Irish tenant has become an absolute proprietor, with unlimited powers of subdivision. If the magic of property does not alter his nature, he will exercise those powers until Ireland is parcelled out into five-acre farms. The tendency of peasant proprietorship has always been in the direction of excessive subdivision, but in Ireland, for various reasons, that tendency will be practically unresisted; and the average size of the farms will be just what will support life, and no more. No conditions can be imagined less favourable to the development of industry, or the production of anything but half-starved human beings. Each "proprietor," in the state of society which we have supposed, would live, or die, upon the produce of his own plot of ground; there would be no surplus for markets, no rearing of improved stock, no stimulus to produce anything better than the ordinary. The cities and towns would dwindle away. There would be no employment for capital, and even the railways should cease running, for no one would require to leave his own immediate neighbourhood. Commerce would, of course, perish, and the noblest harbours in the world would be void of sails. This is the state of things which would inevitably result from the reduction of society to the condition of primeval simplicity; and the abolition of landlordism would ultimately lead to the greatest poverty of the greatest number.

In these gloomy anticipations we shall be glad to be contradicted by actual events. The crisis is, indeed, one of extreme gravity; but, inasmuch as it is a crisis, there is still room for hope. The Land Act has been passed, and cannot be recalled. Its provisions are in themselves neither impolitic nor unjust; but they have been, unfortunately, applied at the wrong time, and administered under the influence of panic. Had such an Act been passed in 1877 it would have wrought nothing but good. Had it been postponed till the country was in a healthy condition its administration would have been vastly facilitated. It has, however, now been made the foundation of a new system, and it is the duty of all right-minded men to accept that Act in a liberal spirit, since by its influence alone can be achieved what they must earnestly desire—the pacification of Ireland.

Notices of Catholic Continental Periodicals.

ITALIAN PERIODICALS.

La Civiltà Cattolica, 19 Novembre, 1881.

The Schools in Italy.

THE *Civiltà Cattolica* of November 19 contains much interesting matter respecting the schools in Italy. It points out, in the first place, that the increasing public depravity and the instrumentality of the existing school system in bringing this about are beginning to excite uneasiness in the minds of all, even in those of Liberals and unbelievers. All unite in saying that the future destinies of Italy depend mainly, not on the generation which is now declining, but on that which is springing up. Now, the oligarchy which for twenty years has tyrannized over the nation has, amongst its other usurpations, been guilty of the most odious of monopolies, that of education, and has spared nothing to model the rising generation after its own likeness—that is, to bring it up without God and without law; never reflecting that this vicious progeny will be its own chastisement, and the gnawing worm which will consume all the fruits of its own successful villainy. The lamentations of Catholics over this state of things can be easily understood; but that the evil should have become so palpable and menacing as to extract bitter complaints from the very enemies of the Church is a fact which demands notice. The writer selects for exemplification two Liberal journals, the *Gazzetta d'Italia* and the *Vedetta Gazzetta del Popolo*, a Florentine newspaper. The first of these, which, be it observed, no one can call a type of modesty and purity, expresses its indignation in no measured terms concerning the cause which led to a late miserable occurrence, the suicide of a young teacher of the communal school at Segni. The school inspector, who had vainly sought to seduce the poor girl, turned her and her sister out. Left homeless and destitute, she, in a fit of despair, threw herself into a well. The Minister of Public Instruction contented himself with depriving the inspector of his office. "Lay your hands on your hearts, fathers and mothers of families!" exclaims the *Gazzetta*. "Is deprivation sufficient punishment for this gentleman?" The *Vedetta*, a journal remarkable for its Voltairianism and its servility to every dominant party in succession, is nevertheless still more outspoken, for it does not scruple to attack the whole system of school appointments. It taunts Government—that is, the successive Liberalistic Governments of every shade—not only with giving very inadequate remuneration to the teachers engaged in primary instruction, but with making a very bad selection. Allowing themselves to be guided by the "grotesque criterion of politics," they have filled the schools with men who had shouted at a demonstration, who had supported a candidate of theirs, or had done them some

audacious and disreputable service, and with a tribe of degraded priests, *bon vivants*, sensual livers, immoral men; to such as these the delicate charge of instructing youth and inspecting their instructors has been committed; while the career has been closed to excellent young men, well qualified for the office, only because they did not enjoy Governmental favour. "The most sane part of the nation," this journal proceeds to say, "the fathers and mothers of families," who watch over their children "as a treasure confided to them by God, are beginning to cry out, 'Your schools frighten us!'" This is strong, considering the quarter whence it proceeds. The *Gazetta d'Italia* also does not disguise its fears that facts similar to that of Segni may occur elsewhere, in the case of other poor girls removed far from the protection of their families in order to seek a livelihood. It is pitiable, indeed, to reflect on the shoals of young women who, leaving honest manual labour, obtain—who can say how?—their diplomas, and crowd into the schools, where they receive the most scanty pittance, and are quite under the control (one may say, at the mercy) of masters often such as the *Vedetta* indignantly describes. It is a significant fact, and one which is well known, that the personal appearance of these young girls is often much more taken into consideration in engaging them than their qualifications as teachers; and advertisements may be seen in the newspapers desiring the candidates for situations as mistresses in the communal schools to send in their likenesses as a preliminary.

But the Liberal press does not limit itself to declaiming against the immorality and incapacity of schoolmasters; it has a word to say about atheism and irreligion.

And it is just at the moment [says the *Vedetta*] that the Onorevole Baccelli chooses to go and preach the abolition of all religious teaching in the schools of the people. A man of his ability, who could do so much good; the representative, as Minister, of millions of men who have a religion—a faith—from whose lips ought to fall maxims of the highest wisdom; this man thinks he can do nothing better or more useful than to go and declare war against God, in the name of the Government. The Onorevole Baccelli wants to depose God, as he might one of his own delegates. He wants to drive from the schools the Supreme Being, the basis of morality, as if he were an unruly scholar, an individual holding subversive opinions, a Krumir. The Onorevole Baccelli wants to eradicate from the conscience of youth—every man who has a heart can judge how opportunely—even the pure and sublime sentiment of a mysterious God, the *Deus absconditus* who made Isaias tremble, as if the soul of youth, which is continually turning with eternal aspirations to the universe, could find satisfaction anywhere save in the Infinite. As for me, I must plainly say that between the humble village schoolmaster—an upright and worthy man, who, amidst the straits and isolation to which he is reduced, speaks of God to his scholars—and a Minister, who takes twenty-five thousand francs a year from a nation of Christians to preach official atheism, it does not seem possible to hesitate as to which to accord the superiority. Suicides [he continues] are multiplying—suicides of masters, suicides of scholars. The system is becoming contagious; and one might almost say that the children go to school to learn how to kill themselves.

The journalist concludes by demanding that God should be left in the schools, and the vicious men, who lay snares for virtue, give scandalous examples, and corrupt youth, should be expelled from them. When this energetic remonstrance appeared in the *Vedetta*, the echo of the infamous speech, at Milan, of the Minister of Public Instruction had scarcely died away. In an assembly of schoolmasters and school-mistresses, he had made a blasphemous attack upon the Catholic Catechism and denounced a courageous young teacher because, in the face of the whole assembly, she had maintained the necessity of teaching it in the schools. Baccelli has threatened to banish all dogma from them, substituting "experimental science," to which he looks for training up "generous and strong patriots." "It is of course impossible," observes the writer, "for a Minister by a simple decree to abrogate an existing law." As the law now stands, elementary instruction, both in the lower and the higher grades, must include religious teaching. But of what practical avail is the law in so many of the schools, where, as a matter of fact, atheism is taught? Take the following as a specimen:—In a large commune of central Italy the schoolmaster is a youth, not yet five-and-twenty. He teaches the Catechism because the municipality bids him do so; but, when the lesson is finished, he tells his scholars that all which they have been learning is a pack of lies and inventions, and then he gives the boys his own private creed, the first article of which is, "That man is free to choose the religion which he finds the most convenient and profitable for him." Do the Liberals really desire, the writer proceeds to ask, that education should fashion worthy men, and that the schools should no longer be national seminaries for places of punishment or of vice?—that it should no longer be necessary to cry out in the Chamber, with the deputy Toscanelli, "Handcuffs! we want handcuffs! first the handcuffs, and then the spelling-book; first the carabinieri, and then the schoolmasters!" If so, let them cease to fear liberty; let them have done with that shameful tyranny by which they have confiscated, for themselves alone, that most holy and inviolable of liberties which God has accorded to fathers of families. Let them, for once and all, restore freedom of teaching, which shall liberate parents from the infamous obligation of sending their children to schools which, as the *Vedetta* says, "frighten" them. Nay, they frighten not a few fathers belonging to the ultra-Liberal party, and in high position, who place too much value on the innocence of their children to content their associates by sacrificing it. Even as early as 1873 Bonghi exclaimed in the Chamber, "I see very many who say much more evil of the Frati than I do, who yet send their own children to the schools of the Frati." And two years later, the deputy Liroy complained that many of his colleagues sent their sons and daughters to the schools of religious orders—nay, even to the Jesuits—rather than to the Government schools. Is it possible, then, asks the writer in the *Civiltà*, that there should be found Catholics sufficiently blinded by ludicrous pretensions, or intimidated by human respect, to throw their children, without a shadow of remorse, into those black holes, where, according even

to such a journal as the *Vedetta*, a poisonous air is breathed. He knows well by what difficulties they are often encompassed; but let them do all that lies in their power, and spare neither exertions nor expense where the eternal interests of the children, of whom God will one day require an account at their hands, are at stake. Let them act as they would in times of pestilence; and, at any rate, use for the preservation of their families, from moral corruption, the same care and precaution which they would certainly adopt to shield them from infection if the plague surrounded their dwellings.

FRENCH PERIODICALS.

Revue des Questions Historiques. Oct. 1881, Paris.

Lanfranc et Guillaume le Conquérant. Par M. Albert du Boys.

WERE the writer of an historical monograph in our own language to begin his essay with some such paragraph as the following: "Our hero, after a brilliant academical career in his own country, came to England and settled in Penzance, but soon left that town, being ambitious of earning laurels in the great metropolis; scarcely, however, had he started on his journey, when already in sight of Windsor Castle, he fell among thieves," we should be inclined to say that, unless our author had done himself a grave injustice, he must surely lack that quality of inexorable carefulness in little things which the historic muse requires of her votaries. It is pretty much in this style that M. Albert du Boys introduces Archbishop Lanfranc to us in this article:—"At the beginning of his journey (from Avranches to Rouen), and close to the Risle, he was attacked by brigands." The Risle is more than a hundred miles from Avranches. It need not, therefore, surprise us to find that this blunder is followed by others, and worse. After telling us how the traveller was tied to a tree, our essayist proceeds, "He wanted to say some prayers; but, strange to say, he did not know literally and by heart the prayers most recommended by the Church;" that is to say, we presume, not even the "Paternoster," nor the "Miserere." Very strange! Then follows blunder upon blunder with a rapidity that takes away our breath, for the traveller on being unloosed did not ask for "a monastery," but for the meanest and poorest monastery within reach, his object being to escape the fame he had already learned to despise. Neither when he found Herluin was that holy abbot, "having an oven built," he was constructing it with his own hands, being very poor. Neither did Herluin, on learning his visitor's purpose, turn to Dom Roger and say, "Brother Roger, go and get the rule of the convent, and come and read it to this traveller," for prime had not been said, and it was the rule to observe strict silence between compline overnight and prime next morning, never violating silence but under extreme necessity. Neither did Lanfranc swear to keep the rule; the rule forbade swearing. And so on, and so on, page after page. All these blunders are on the first page.

M. du Boys next tells us that Herluin made his postulant undergo a noviciate of three years. He perhaps might have done so had Lanfranc been a pagan; but three days, or, at the utmost, three weeks, would be nearer the truth, for Le Bec was famous for short, and in cases like this extremely short, noviciates.

Even the story about the mal-correction of Lanfranc's Latin is wrongly told by M. du Boys. It was not the abbot, but the prior, who fell into the mistake; for the abbot knew too well of what sort Lanfranc's scholarship was to make himself so ridiculous. Nor was the word *docere*. It might have been *regina*, *pastorem*, or what not. The remainder of the first section of the article—there are nine of them—bristles with errors of varying degrees of gravity; but their enumeration would weary the reader. We will, therefore, omit two pages and resume our examination with the second section.

Speaking of the Conqueror's consecration to the kingly office, M. du Boys says, "*L'élection des grands et les acclamations de la foule, c'était le vox populi. Le couronnement par le ministre des autels était le vox Dei*"—a curious version of, perhaps, the most trite proverb employed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries; a proverb which made *vox populi* and *vox Dei* not two things but one, and understood by *populus* not the peerage, and not the crowd, but precisely the class which lay between the two, to the exclusion, however, of the clergy. Then M. du Boys confounds consecration with coronation, and imagines that the Conqueror caused his consecration to be repeated; a very serious error. Kings were never reconsecrated, but were solemnly crowned over and over again, and notably at the three festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, not only in England, but in Germany, in France, and probably in Ireland.

Later on in the essay we are told that, in accordance with the *ad interim* accommodation arranged between the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in the year 1072, the latter took an oath of obedience to the former. This is precisely what he did not do. Lanfranc dispensed provisionally with the oath, without prejudice, however, to his successors, and contented himself with a written profession. Then M. du Boys seems to think that there were already churches in western Christendom of gigantic proportions as compared with Lanfranc's cathedral at Canterbury; but he has not given us their names; nor does he offer any authority for the statement that the western front of Lanfranc's church at Le Bec was flanked with towers. The probability is that they were not.

To enumerate all the mistakes in our essayist's account of the miracle wrought at the Confessor's tomb in honour of St. Wulstan would extend this notice far beyond its due limits; we must, therefore, leave it. But the most marvellous thing about these and other errors in matters of detail, some of them of great historical importance, and most of them of great moral interest, is not their number but their perversity. Thus, eye-witnesses of the consecration of Abbot Herluin's later church inform us that the Conqueror was not present at the ceremony, and suggest some

characteristic and noteworthy reasons for his absence; but M. du Boys knows better, and assures us that not only the prince but his wife and family were there. Here, again, blunder follows blunder with almost atrocious perversity, until we are constrained to doubt whether M. du Boys has not written his whole article at second-hand. He cannot even bury Herluin in the right place, but lays him to rest in the church instead of the chapter-house.

One of the sweetest pictures in all history is the picture drawn by Eadmer of the aged primate of the Britains consulting, we might almost say, his young friend—a friend between thirty and forty years younger than himself—upon the claim of St. Elphege to a place in the calendar; but this peculiarly charming and peculiarly edifying consultation has been converted into such an angry dispute that an unwary reader must assuredly feel thankful, by the time he gets to the end of M. du Boys' account, that the archbishop and the abbot did not come to blows. Mistakes like this are sure to occur if Catholic writers abroad, instead of discovering for themselves the truth in original sources, are content to trust too implicitly in such matters, to the authority of English Protestant historians of however high name.

It does not astonish us to find that M. du Boys is not particularly strong in canon law, or in what may be called ecclesiastical politics. Thus he gets into sad trouble about Duke William's marriage, and seems to think that the "Court of Rome" was in the eleventh century inspired by a somewhat different aim from that which she now obeys. In those days *elle ne cherchait pas à attirer tout à elle*; because, forsooth, Alexander II. declined to give a decision upon the boundary line of the province of Canterbury on the ground that, the question mooted being one which local tradition could decide, that particular detail—a detail unessential to the controversy to which it appertained—had better be settled where the local tradition could be learned. Later on in the essay he informs us that when Napoleon I., in his anxiety to reinstate the Church in France, had recourse to the Pope, he, without knowing it and without wishing it, put it into the Pope's power to stretch the exercise of his prerogatives to the extremest limits of his *plenaria potestas*. Then follows something about the invasion of the domain of dogma by a certain "movement," and then something about *les doctrines romaines* which, thanks to Napoleon III., triumphed at the Council of the Vatican.

It is hard to tell where to stop in this thankless examination. Of course M. du Boys quite mistakes the drift of a statement assigned to the Conqueror on his death-bed about his *jus hereditarium* and the Crown of England; for writers of approved merit—nay, many and even most of them—have failed to understand it; but even here, as elsewhere, M. du Boys seems determined to outstrip his predecessors, and, failing to make their mistake about the Conqueror's *jus hereditarium* greater than he found it, contrives notwithstanding to invent a blunder of his own, and transforms the Conqueror from King of the English into King of Great Britain! In perfect harmony

with this is the grave assurance that it is quite a mistake of Mr. Freeman's to imagine that in his official relations with Ireland Archbishop Lanfranc was performing the functions of viceroy to his Britannic Majesty William the Conqueror. Mr. Freeman may have made a few mistakes in his time, but he never made that!

It may be well to remark, in conclusion, that Lanfranc and William the Conqueror did not flourish in the tenth century, but in the eleventh.

M. R.

GERMAN PERIODICALS.

By Dr. BELLESHEIM, Cologne.

1. *Katholik.*

The September and October numbers contain two articles by Dr. Joseph Pohle on the new theory of "space," recently so much talked of in Germany; according to which, space does not consist of three, but of four dimensions. Professor Zöllner, of Leipzig University, the celebrated astrophysicist, is the chief propounder of this theory; as by it he hopes to explain the spiritistic phenomena he has been studying in connection with Slade and other mediums. Dr. Pohle refutes the theory very successfully as destructive of the first principles of physiology by denying intercourse between the senses and the outer world, and as robbing even mathematical axioms of their absolute value. The October number contains also the first part of a long article on the various opinions lately advocated by Catholic and non-Catholic authors concerning the persecution under Nero. The opinion, held generally up to the end of the seventeenth century, that Nero was the first Emperor who persecuted the Christian religion, was attacked by Dodwell in his "*Dissertationes Cyprianicæ*." Dodwell limited Nero's persecution to the City of Rome (Gibbon still further restricting it to the Jews—excluding all Christians), and contended that they were so persecuted, not for religion's sake, but as having set fire to Rome. This view was recently introduced into Kraus's "*Realencyklopädie der christlichen Alterthums*;" the present inquiry into the question is therefore very opportune. The writer cites and criticizes almost every Latin and Greek author who has mentioned the matter. That Nero did not persecute, but rather protected, the Jews is unanswerably testified by Josephus ("*Antiq.*" xx. 8, 11), who tells us "that Nero admitted an embassy of the Jews to audience with him, forgave them what had occurred, and permitted that the building of a wall near the temple of Jerusalem might be continued, in order to gratify his wife." Poppea Sabina, however profligate, was intimately connected with the Jews, as she had adopted their ceremonies and practised them. Her influence in the Imperial Court accounts for the Christians being persecuted by the Emperor from hatred of their

religion. An immense number of witnesses, heathen and Christian, are cited by the author of this article.

2. *Historisch-politische Blätter*. The issues of September 16 and October 4, contain critical articles on the ninth and tenth volumes of Dr. Onno Klopp's work, "The Downfall of the House of Stuart in Relation with the General Politics of Europe." The ninth volume deals mainly with William's endeavours to unite all the European Courts against Louis XIV., and to secure to the House of Hanover succession to the English throne. Dr. Klopp bases his work on the despatches of the Imperial ambassadors residing at the Court of St. James, Mr. Hoffmann and Count Wratislaw. It is curious to hear that King William unreservedly admitted the Imperial ambassadors to a confidence, which he did not extend even to Lords Rochester and Godolphin. Whoever, therefore, wishes to become acquainted with the secret politics of William III. ought to consult neither the London State Paper Office, nor the British Museum, but the important despatches sent from London to Vienna by the Imperial ambassadors. Lord Macaulay was fully justified in complaining of the want of documents in English archives referring to the year 1701; the reason being the confidence with which King William treated the Emperor's diplomatic agents and his distrust of his own ministers. The tenth volume is occupied with the years 1702 and 1703 and the beginning of Queen Anne's reign. One great mistake is corrected by Dr. Klopp, the mistake of thinking that the Electress Sophia of Hanover had endeavoured by every means to secure for her House the English succession. And as to Queen Anne, Dr. Klopp shows that she sought to keep the English crown for the descendants she hoped she would have in the course of time; in this way would she be remedying the wrong she had done to King James, her father, by accepting the crown of England in opposition to him. Dr. Klopp's history of the fall of the Stuart dynasty is one of the most noteworthy historical works that has appeared during recent years in Germany; compiled, as it is, from unpublished and trustworthy manuscripts in the Imperial archives of Vienna. It may be doubted, however, whether all his deductions are quite sound; since he has obviously little kindly feeling for the Stuarts and a great deal for King William. And as to William's treatment of Catholic Ireland, I should suppose Dr. Klopp is decidedly wrong, since King William is known to have been one of the most cruel persecutors of the Church in that land.

3. The *Stimmen aus Maria Laach* contains an article on the history of the Ruthenian Church, written by Dr. Pelesz, of Vienna. We earnestly recommend this exhaustive work to English divines, since Dr. Pelesz has been enabled, by his familiar acquaintance with the Slav languages, to treat very thoroughly a most intricate period of ecclesiastical history. In our days of the great Slav movement the work possesses especial interest for the scholar.

Notices of Books.

Cardinal Newman; the Story of His Life. By HENRY J. JENNINGS.
Birmingham: Houghton & Co; London: Simpkin & Marshall, 1882.

THE writer of this short, popular, and handsomely-printed life of Cardinal Newman has performed his task in a way that calls for little criticism. He professes to have endeavoured to write without, on the one hand, concealing that he himself is a Protestant, or, on the other, giving offence to Catholics. The book is certainly as fair as one could expect from a non-Catholic. It is, in fact, largely made up of the Cardinal's own autobiography, of descriptions of his books, and of narratives of facts. The three points of his career which it is hardest for a Protestant to discuss fairly are his secession from the Anglican Establishment, his controversy with Kingsley, and his attitude in reference to the opportuneness of the definition of the Pope's infallibility. On all these subjects Mr. Jennings is really honest, and, in the main, trustworthy. He needlessly mars the effect of his narrative of the Kingsley episode by printing paragraphs from that gentleman's widow, and from the late Dean Stanley, to the effect that Kingsley was really right in his ideas about the attitude of Catholics towards truth, though he was unfortunate in his method of proving it. Mr. Jennings, moreover, has inserted one page which is really offensive and utterly inexact. We refer to the passage beginning on p. 47, in which the writer elaborately puts forth the view that "the structure of Dr. Newman's mind not only enabled, but encouraged him, to" yield credence to things which "shocked men of sober sense," and, in fact, to be "what many people would call" superstitious. The great Oratorian has himself answered these unworthy imputations. It can be no more superstitious to believe in ecclesiastical miracles than in the miracles of the Bible. There is also a copy of scurrilous verses on Mr. Newman's first journey to Rome which might well have been left out. These are, however, perhaps the only passages we can reasonably blame in a book which will doubtless be welcome to many. A good photograph, a fac-simile of the original of "Lead, kindly Light!" and two very ordinary woodcuts, are intended to add to the attractions of the work.

The Excellences of the Congregation of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri.
Translated from the Italian and abridged by FREDERICK IGNATIUS
ANTROBUS, of the same Congregation. London: BURNS & OATES.
1881.

A VERY serviceable work, or rather series of works, might be written on the Rule, the *œuvre*, and the special genius of the various Religious Orders and Congregations of men and women which adorn the Church.

Of the chief amongst them some of the greater features are more or less imperfectly known. In most cases some account of them may be found in the lives of the Saints who have instituted them. But for souls who are feeling their way after a vocation, for those who seek their own edification in the study of God's works in His Church, not to speak of the legitimate curiosity of the general reading public, something more express and detailed is wanted.

The work which Fr. Antrobus has translated supplies just such information about the Congregation of the Oratory, and would be a good model for members of other religious bodies to follow. The work entitled "*Pregi della Congregazione dell' Oratorio di S. Filippo Neri*," was written by Fr. Francesco Agnelli, who died in 1749, at the age of eighty-one, in the Oratory of Savigliano. He did not print it himself, but the MS. fell, after his death, into the hands of the Fathers of the Chioggia Oratory, who published it in 1825. The twelve Excellences, or "*Pregi*," which the author treats of, as characteristic of his Congregation, in the twelve chapters forming the book, are the following:—1. The exalted end of the vocation of the Oratory. 2. Avoidance of Ecclesiastical dignities. 3. Charity. 4. Interior mortification. 5. Obedience. 6. Discretion and prudence in the government of the Congregation. 7. Esteem of Virtue. 8. Detachment from possessions. 9. Detachment from relations. 10. Chastity. 11. The good name which the Congregation of the Oratory enjoys. 12. The power of the Congregation to expel its subjects, and the freedom of its subjects to leave it.

It may be asked—Fr. Antrobus naturally remarks in his preface—in what way do charity, purity, detachment, &c., as practised under the protection of St. Philip, differ from the exercise of the same virtues in any other institute?

He answers:—

It has been remarked that in the great Religious Orders there are Saints, each one of whom represents to his spiritual descendants a different kind of Sanctity. There is a preacher, a missionary, a theologian, or a novice carried off in the first bloom of his religious life. Here are so many types upon which a religious may form himself according to the special bent of his character. But in the Congregation of the Oratory we do not find this variety. When St. Philip was burning to go to the Indies to preach the gospel in the hope of perhaps gaining the martyr's crown, it was revealed to him that his Indies were to be in Rome. The same is to be the case with his children. Wherever Providence may have placed them, there they are to remain, to do their appointed work, there to live and die. It is a life singularly deficient in accident, and entirely devoid of all character of romance. There is to be but one type for the sons of St. Philip. They are, each one of them, to seek to reproduce the life of their Father. The Excellences are to partake of the spirit of the Founder, to imitate his distinctive traits. Each virtue is to present itself steeped in his genius (Pref. p. vi.).

Accordingly, the exercise of these specially Filippine virtues is illustrated throughout from the holy Founder's practice, from the lives of his first companions and other Oratorians famous in after times

for holiness, from the Rule, and from the customs and observances of the Congregation.

Fr. Antrobus is not without hopes that such a study of the "Filippine" spirit may lead to the formation of new Congregations.

The peculiar circumstances of our times, he writes, give a certain character of opportuneness to the present publication. The hostility which in the present day unfortunately prevails to so great an extent in many countries against the Church and her ministers, the malignity of the attacks upon her, and the persevering misrepresentations of the spirit and lives of the clergy, render unity in action on their part more than ever to be desired. The wish expressed by more than one of the members of the episcopate, and, what is to us still more important, the desire of the bishops of our country, published in the decrees of the Fourth Provincial Council of Westminster, held in 1873, to see the *vita communis* practised among the secular clergy, lead to the hope that further acquaintance with the spirit of the Institute of St. Philip may conduce to a gradual development of the Oratory, and that, as has been so often seen in its history, two or three priests agreeing to live together and to observe the Rule, may in time come to form a new Congregation, and thus in many of our populous centres our holy Father may find new homes in which to do his own work of sanctification, through prayer, frequentation of the sacraments and the daily word of God (Pref. p. ix.).

While, however, the book is primarily adapted, as Fr. Antrobus seems to indicate, to the members of St. Philip's Congregations, and secondarily to the souls specially under their guidance, it is evidently not unfitted for general spiritual reading. It contains lessons of spirituality which apply to all, and lessons conveyed in a homely, yet persuasive way, characteristic of the school from which they come, and peculiarly attractive and efficacious.

Among incidental matters of interest in the volume is a note on Fr. Thomas Somerset, mentioned in the text as an instance of the favour and affection shown to the Oratory by Pope Clement IX., who sent him as internuncio to the Court of Charles II. We think our readers will thank us for giving the note entire :—

This Father Thomas Somerset was probably the first English son of St. Philip. He was a son of Henry Somerset, first Marquess of Worcester, famous for his devotion to the royalist cause and his defence of Raglan Castle, who became a Catholic. His son chose a voluntary exile in early youth, in order to preserve his faith untainted. He studied for many years in Perugia, and then repaired to Rome, where he received marks of honour from both Innocent X. and Alexander VII., and was made Canon of St. Peter's. But the impression formerly made upon him by the virtuous lives of the Fathers of the Oratory at Perugia was so great, that he renounced all his dignities and entered the Congregation in that city, where he became distinguished for his great humility and charity. During his mission to England he might easily have fulfilled his ardent wish of giving his blood for the Catholic faith, had not Charles II. constrained him to fly into Flanders, himself providing him with a passage thither. From thence he wrote an affectionate letter to his beloved Fathers at Perugia, detailing all he had done and suffered, and expressing his longing desire to return amongst them to end his days in the bosom of the Congregation he so much loved. But God ordained otherwise. He was attacked by a mortal disease at Dunkirk and died there in 1678, aged 78 (p. 293).

Fr. Antrobus's translation reads well, and has avoided the fault, often found in translations from the Italian, of reproducing the diffuse and wordy style to which that language lends itself. We are glad to notice also that he has furnished his book with a very full and carefully compiled index. Without going so far as the Roxburghe Club, which is said to have passed a resolution to the effect that the publication of a book without an index should be an indictable offence, we could earnestly wish the practice were universally followed.

We wish Fr. Antrobus's book all the success which we should expect from its intrinsic merit, as well as from the wide influence the Fathers of the Oratory have won for themselves in England; and we repeat, that it will be one important merit of the work if it stimulates members of other religious bodies to produce similar treatises.

Introduction to the Study of English History. By SAMUEL R. GARDINER, Hon. LL.D., and J. BASS MULLINGER, M.A. London: C. Kegan Paul, 1881.

WE took up this book with pleasant anticipations. We lay it down with disappointment. Its authors are undoubtedly among the most diligent and accomplished historical scholars that England possesses just now, and their volume is admirably conceived. But it fails in some particulars where success was of the utmost importance. Let us explain what we mean.

Messrs. Gardiner and Mullinger aimed at producing a work which should, in the first place, indicate to students of English History the books that it would be well for them to study; and which, secondly, should initiate them in the art of understanding that connection between cause and effect which is the necessary preliminary to all sober criticism of actions and persons. And so, in Part I. of this Introduction, Mr. Gardiner gives us an attempt to trace the life of the English nation; while in Part II. Mr. Mullinger presents what we may call an annotated list of authorities, carefully distinguishing, as he tells us, the contemporary sources of information for each period from those of later times, and seeking "to be strictly impartial and simply to place before the reader the main conclusions of the most recent and approved criticisms." Now, that the work of both these eminent scholars is, in many respects, of high excellence, we gladly testify. But each of them appears to us to have fallen into errors which greatly detract from its value.

First, as to Mr. Gardiner. His sketch of the life of the English nation seems to us to have been written under the influence of a theory which has obscured for him in a singular way the meaning and force of facts; a theory which is the peculiar product of the nineteenth century, and according to which he has measured the men and events of former ages. The practical effect is that (to borrow a phrase from one of the Dean of St. Paul's admirable essays) he has peopled past history with phantasms, and coloured it with lines which belong to our own days. That theory is, apparently, that the political organism which we call a nation develops according to laws as necessary and undeviating as

those which regulate the growth of a physical organism. "Everything flows naturally from that which precedes it," he writes in one place (Pref. p. xvii.). And, again, "History is the record of change, of the new circumstances into which communities of men are brought, and of the new ideas called forth by those circumstances, and by which circumstances are in turn moulded" (p. 1). Now, if history were nothing more than this, we for our part should say that history was no more worthy of study than an old almanack. If "everything flows naturally from that which precedes it," the high moral value of the records of the past, as philosophy teaching by example, is gone. And in truth the moral element hardly seems to enter into Mr. Gardiner's historical judgment. This comes out curiously in what he tells us about the so-called Reformation. He apparently cherishes it as a first principle, that the rationalising movement of the last four centuries (which, to be sure, is a movement steadily towards materialism, and away from those ethical conceptions which are impossible without a spiritual background)—Mr. Gardiner, we say, cherishes it as a first principle that the movement, the first decisive outbreak of which in the public order is to be found in the time of Henry VIII., was "an emancipatory movement" (p. 120), that it was a movement in the direction of individuality (p. 108). He regards Henry VIII. as being, in truth, what Gray's poetic fancy pictured:

——— the majestic lord
That broke the bonds of Rome

(p. 107), and pronounces "his conception of a national church to have been large-minded and generous." But what are the facts? Mr. Gardiner in a previous page (p. 106) is obliged to own that the separation from Rome "sprang from a purely personal and even a sensual motive. Henry threw off the authority of the Pope simply because he was tired of a staid and elderly wife and had fallen in love with a flighty young woman"—a singular beginning of a movement in the direction of spiritual freedom and individuality, unless those words are employed in a very peculiar sense indeed. It is absolutely clear, beyond all possibility of doubt, that Henry, in separating himself and his kingdom from Catholic communion, was actuated solely by lust—lust of woman, lust of lucre, lust of power. It is as clear that the effect of that separation was to break down the last feeble restraints upon regal absolutism, and in particular to reduce the spirituality of England—from the archiepiscopal pander who disgraced the throne of St. Thomas down to the humblest parish priest—to a worse than Egyptian bondage. It is really an insult to the understanding of his readers when Mr. Gardiner represents Henry VIII. or Elizabeth as "warring against a tyranny which claimed the right of crushing all independence of judgment under its heel." They were simply warring against a power which was the only possible check upon their own. Nothing is idler than to hold out either of these sovereigns as being in any sense champions of religious freedom. The whole battle between them and the Holy See turned upon the question of the royal supremacy; and that question meant this: whether the spiritual or the secular power should be supreme in the domain of religion. This has been stated with

much perspicuity and force by a writer whose claims to be heard upon the subject Mr. Gardiner would be the first to recognize. And we cannot do better than put before our readers the following extract from the late Professor Brewer's recently published "*English Studies*":—

Every man who cares to read the histories of those times feels at once that [the Royal Supremacy] is the question—this is the keystone of the Reformation; all other topics dwindle into insignificance beside it. This is the real point at issue between the advocates of the old and the new system; this, and not purgatory, not pilgrimages, not transubstantiation. . . . This has spread its broad shadow across the range of centuries. It has fallen like a thing of evil on Romanists and Puritans alike. If it brought More and Fisher to the scaffold in the reign of Henry, it wrung the hearts and wasted the life-blood of Cartwright and the Puritans in the reign of Elizabeth. If it hung like a sword over the heads of the Tudor bishops, and prevented all relapse to Rome, it equally drove out from the pale of the National Church every conscientious Nonconformist who was a zealous Protestant in everything with the exception of this one Article. It kept the Church obedient to the Sovereign, and to the first principles of the Reformation. . . . No distinction [between civil and religious crimes] existed at the time in the mind of either Sovereign or of people; the King, as spiritual head of the Church, assumed to himself the right of punishing [religious] offences, not as contrary to the laws of the State, but as contrary to what he was pleased to determine was the law of God—offences as much against his spiritual as against his temporal power. He never stopped to consider how far this or that creed might be exercised or condemned, and its asserters brought to the scaffold as rebels or as heretics. That was a distinction first set up by the subtle statesmen of the reign of Elizabeth, when persecution for religion was growing unpopular. It had no place in the mind of Henry. The passing of the Six Articles, and the punishment of those who transgressed them, the persecution of Tyndal, and the death of Frith and Barnes, all show this. When he transferred to himself the supremacy of the Church, he transferred with it all the powers which the Church had ever exercised for the punishment of heresy or disobedience to its authority. If the Pope was the Bishop of Bishops, so was he; if the Pope could of himself determine controversies of faith, so did he. Whether the doctrine of purgatory, or the sacrament of penance, or the worship of saints were or were not to constitute part of the creed, and of the teachings of the Church of England, depended upon the King alone. It is true that he did not administer the sacraments and ordain priests and bishops; but if any man had questioned his power to do so, he would have incurred the penalty of high treason. "A bishop," says Cranmer, "may make a priest by the Scripture, and so may princes and governors also, and that by the authority of God committed to them." In common with other Reformers, Cranmer looked to all the spiritual functions as absolutely dependent on the will of the King, as temporal commissions, like those of any other magistrate (p. 302-329).

We really have hardly anything to add to this account of the Anglican Reformation from the pen of a Protestant writer, who, by common consent, was better versed in its history than any other scholar of his age, or indeed of any age. It is enough to show how misleading it is to speak of the ecclesiastical policy of the Tudors as emancipatory. It was indeed emancipatory as regarded themselves, for it freed them

from the last restraints which hung loosely enough upon their authority. But it was not emancipatory as regarded the people. For them it simply substituted King Henry for Pope Clement, Queen Elizabeth for Pope Pius, as supreme governor in matters ecclesiastical. Henry VII. had overthrown well-nigh all the civil liberties of his subjects. Henry VIII. crushed the spiritual power—he found it reduced to a shadow—which in earlier ages had been strong enough to curb the license of Norman and Angevine. It was the finishing stroke of Tudor absolutism, bringing as it did the consciences of men into captivity to the royal authority. And this was why Catholic and Puritan alike resisted it unto death. The truth is that the whole history of our country, from the accession of Henry VII. to the downfall of James II., is quite irreconcilable with Mr. Gardiner's theory of mechanical development, of natural sequence. Those two centuries are a period of retrogression, fiercely resisted at times, but unavailingly, until the great event of 1688 once more (in Lord Chatham's happy phrase) "vindicated" the liberties of the subject. The whole policy of the Stuarts was conceived in the spirit of their Tudor predecessors. The doctrines of immediate Divine right and passive obedience, so dear to the Jameses and the Charleses (the real meaning and practical importance of which Mr. Gardiner much under-estimates), were the fitting complement and crown of the tremendous extension of the prerogative by the last two Henrys. Europe was well-nigh everywhere following the same path in the public order. The peculiarity of our history—due, no doubt, in great measure to the ineradicable influences of race—is that, while in other countries the free institutions of the Middle Ages were almost entirely swept away, with us they were merely perverted into instruments of tyranny. As Mr. Freeman tells us with exact truth, in his admirable lectures on the growth of the English Constitution, under Henry VIII. the Parliaments, like judges, juries, and ecclesiastical synods, ordered whatever seemed good to the caprice of the despot. But then the Parliaments remained; and in the ashes of our old constitutional freedom slept its wonted fires, ready, when the appointed time should come, to be kindled into a blaze. In the days of the great Queen, who, foul and manifold as are the blots which stain her name, was in every fibre of her an Englishwoman, and who understood her countrymen, the spirit of the men "who taught the Edwards and the Richards that there was a power mightier than their own," reasserted itself, and caused even her imperious will to hesitate and pause. But it required the combined dulness and doggedness of the Second James to prove fully to the world the vitality of our ancient constitutional institutions, and of the spirit of freedom of which they were the sacred shrines.

So much must suffice, in the brief notice to which we are here restricted, to indicate in rough outline the nature and cause of our divergence from Mr. Gardiner. Mr. Mullinger's annotated catalogue, which forms the second part of the work, is evidently the fruit of much labour, and we do not doubt that it has been executed with honesty of purpose. There are, however, some strange omissions in it: as a sample of them, we may mention that he does not give among his authorities for the period from A.D. 1485 to A.D. 1603, Mr. Pocock's

invaluable "Records of the Reformation." His estimates of his authorities, moreover, are sometimes much behind the age. Thus, Foxe, the chronicler, whose strange and extravagant lies have been so abundantly exposed of late years, is described by him as "a man of high character and undoubted integrity of purpose" (p. 309); while Sander, whose curious and minute accuracy has been so singularly confirmed by recent investigators, is mentioned only in an addendum; and even then with the grudging and altogether inadequate statement that "his treatise is frequently appealed to *by the writers of his party* as authoritative, and embodies, *they maintain*, a more truthful representation of events than that given by Protestant writers" (p. 330). (*The italics are our own.*) It has been shown at length in this Review,* that it is to non-Catholic writers that we owe the vindication of Sander's authority and veracity. And Mr. Mullinger's ignorance upon this point suggests doubts as to the completeness of his acquaintance with that "most recent and approved criticism," the "main results" of which he had led his readers to expect. W. S. L.

History of Materialism, and Criticisms of its Present Importance. By FREDERICK ALBERT LANGE. Authorized Translation: by ERNEST CHESTER THOMAS. In three volumes. London: Trübner

A FEW years ago Messrs. Trübner projected an English and Foreign Philosophical Library, "which should represent all developments of philosophy, from Spinoza to Hartmann, and from Leibnitz to Lütze." The first work selected by them for a place in their collection was the "History of Materialism, and Criticism of its Present Importance," by Dr. Albert Lange. Professor Tyndall, in his address to the British Association at Belfast, had acknowledged his indebtedness to "the spirit and the letter" of this work. Professor Huxley had declared, in his "Lay Sermons, Lectures, and Addresses," that a translation of it would be "a great service to philosophy in England." It was apparently, as we learn from the translator's preface, in deference to these *ex cathedra* utterances of the Pontiffs of Agnosticism, that the history of Materialism was chosen as the first instalment of Messrs. Trübner's Philosophical Library, the translator selected being Mr. E. C. Thomas, late scholar of Trinity College, Oxford, whose labours were sanctioned by the author. The first volume of Mr. Thomas's English version appeared in 1878. The second followed at a short interval. Now the third is before us. The work is thus completed, and we proceed to say something about it.

In the first place, let us testify that Mr. Thomas has done his part well. That his translation is elegant we do not aver, but then the original is not elegant. Lange was a German professor, and although by no means so detestable a writer as most of his brethren, he did not altogether escape the heavy, lumbering, uncultured style which, as Schopenhauer has somewhere observed, is the *spécialité* of the Teutonic

* See an article entitled "The True View of the Protestant Reformation," published in our issue of July 15, 1877.

teaching body. Mr. Thomas's English version is a careful and accurate reproduction of his author in idiomatic English. He has done his work well, we repeat. But was it worth doing?

We think it was. Our reason for thinking this is, of course, a very different reason from that which prompted the eulogies which we have cited from Messrs. Huxley and Tyndall. We by no means regard Dr. Lange's book as an important contribution to philosophic thought. But this much we cheerfully concede: that it states the case for Materialism fully, and thus enables those who have any just occasion for investigating that system to estimate it at its true value. Indeed, to say that Lange states the case for Materialism fully is to say too little. He overstates it. He ranks too highly, by a long way, the logical value of the arguments in favour of it, and does not by any means do justice to those on the other side. We do not know who has more fairly characterized the work than Professor Flint, of Edinburgh:—

It everywhere shows clearness, vigour, and critical acuteness of intellect, a wide acquaintance with the positive sciences, a competent knowledge of the writings of the chief ancient and modern Materialists, and the power of natural and spirited expression. It has no claim, however, to be considered as in any sense an epoch-making book, and is not without great faults. Strictly speaking, it is not a history of Materialism, but a history of science, written on the assumption that the whole world of knowledge can alone be explained by matter and mechanism. It is, to a far larger extent, an exposition of the theories, and a discussion of the problems, which seem to its author to bear on Materialism, than an account and criticism of directly Materialistic speculations. It nowhere gives evidence of original research or great erudition, and has thrown little new light on any period of the history the course of which it traces ("Anti-Theistic Theories," p. 459).

With the estimate thus expressed by this judicious and candid writer we in the main agree. Let us add, however, that there is one very remarkable lacuna in Dr. Lange's work to which special attention ought to be called. He gives us next to no information about Mediæval Materialism—a most curious and interesting subject, never, so far as we know, adequately dealt with.

Let us, however, pass over the merely historical portion of this work and come to the critical, which, after all, is the most important. Let us see what, according to Professor Lange and Mr. Thomas, is the present importance of Materialism. In the first place, what do they mean by Materialism? "The true element in Materialism," they tell us (vol. ii. p. 391), is "the exclusion of the miraculous and arbitrary from the nature of things." And, again (vol. iii. p. 336), "Materialism, more than any other system, keeps to reality—i.e., to the sum total of the necessary phenomena given to us by the compulsion of sense"—the brain, and all the organs of sentient life, being among such phenomena. And, once more:—"The whole problem of force and matter runs into a problem of the theory of knowledge" (vol. ii. p. 390), and there he is content to leave it. But this is not all:—

A reality such as man imagines to himself, and as he yearns after when this imagination is dispelled (he writes)—an existence absolutely

fixed, and independent of us, while it is yet known by us—such a reality does not exist, and cannot exist, because the synthetic creative factor of our knowledge extends, in fact, into the very first sense-impressions, and even into the elements of logic. The world is not only *idea*, but also *our idea*: a product of the organization of the *species* in the universal and necessary characteristics of all experience; of the *individual* in the synthesis that deals freely with the object. We may also say that the reality is the phenomenon for the species, while the delusive appearance, on the contrary, is a phenomenon for the individual, which only becomes an error by reality, *i.e.*, existence for the species, being ascribed it. But the task of producing harmony among phenomena, and of linking the manifold that is given to us into unity, belongs not merely to the synthetic factors of experience, but also to those of speculation. Here, however, the connecting organization of the species leaves us in the lurch; the individual speculates in his own fashion, and the product of this speculation acquires importance for the species, or rather for the nation and contemporaries, only in so far as the individual creating it is endowed with rich and normal talents, and is typical in his modes of thought, while by his intellectual energy he is called to be a leader. The conceptional poesy of speculation is, however, not even so completely free; it still strives, like empirical research, after a unitary exhibition of data in their connection, but it lacks the guiding compulsion of the principles of experience. Only in poesy, in the narrower sense of the word, in poetry, is the ground of reality consciously abandoned. In speculation, form has the preponderance over matter; in poetry, it is completely dominant. The poet creates in the free play of his spirit a world to his own liking, in order to impress more vividly upon the easily manageable material a form which has its own intrinsic value, and its importance independently of the problems of knowledge (vol. iii., p. 336).

It will be seen that Dr. Lange is a Materialist with a difference. Matter and its laws he holds to be the only facts in the proper sense of the word. Philosophy and religion he treats not as real, but as notional. Let us hear him again on this subject:—

So long as men sought the core of religion in the elevation of our souls above the real, and in the creation of a home of the spirit, then the purest forms may produce essentially the same psychological processes as the charcoal-burner's creed of the uncultured masses, and all the philosophical refinement of ideas will never bring us to zero. An unrivalled model of this is the way in which Schiller, in his "Realm of Shadows," has generalized the Christian doctrine of redemption into the idea of an æsthetical redemption. The elevation of the soul in faith here becomes the flight into the idea-land of beauty, where all labour finds its rest—every struggle and every want their peace and their reconciliation. But the heart which is terrified by the awful power of the law which no mortal can resist, opens itself to the Divine will, which it recognizes as the true essence of its own will, and thus finds itself reconciled with Deity. If these moments of elevation are but fleeting, yet they work with freeing and purifying effect upon the soul, and in the distance appears the perfection which no one can any more deprive us of, figured under the image of Herakles mounting to the skies. This poem is a product of a time and a sphere of culture which were certainly not inclined to concede too much to what was specifically Christian; the poet of the "Gods of Greece" does not conceal himself; everything here is in a sense Pagan; and yet Schiller here stands nearer to the traditional life of Christian faith than the rationalizing dogmatism which arbitrarily maintains the notion

of God, and abandons the doctrine of redemption as irrational. Let us accustom ourselves, then, to attribute a higher worth than hitherto to the principle of the creative idea in itself, and apart from any correspondence with historical and scientific knowledge, but also without any falsification of them; let us accustom ourselves to regard the world of ideas as figurative representation of the entire truth, just as indispensable to all human progress as the knowledge of the understanding, by resolving the greater or less import of every idea into ethical and æsthetic principles (vol. iii., p. 345).

Professor Lange manifests an uneasy feeling that his prescription of a gigantic make-belief will not please the judicious reader. "This advice," he writes, "will indeed appear to many an old, and even new believer, as if we were to draw the ground from beneath his feet and ask him to remain standing as if nothing had happened." Surely so. But let us hear the Professor once more, and that in a passage which we quote with the more pleasure because it reveals him at his best:—

Meanwhile the dissolving forces act only as they must. They obey the inexorable categorical imperative of thought, the conscience of the understanding, which is awakened so soon as in the creation of the transcendental the Letter becomes conspicuous, because the Spirit leaves it in search of newer forms. But one thing only can finally bring humanity to an ever-during peace—the recognition of the imperishable nature of all poesy in Art, Religion, and Philosophy, and the permanent reconciliation, on the basis of this recognition, of the controversy between investigation and imagination. Then, also, will be found a changeful harmony of the true, the good, and the beautiful, instead of that dead unity to which our Free Congregations are at present clinging, when they make empirical truth their only basis. Whether the future will again build lofty cathedrals, or will content itself with light and cheerful halls; whether organ-peals and the sound of bells will with fresh force thunder through the land, or whether gymnastic and music, in the Greek sense, will be elevated to the centre of the training of a new epoch—in no case will the past be entirely lost, and in no case will the obsolete reappear unaltered. In a certain sense the ideas of religion, too, are imperishable. Who will refute a Mass of Palestrina, or who will convict Raphael's Madonna of error? The "Gloria in Excelsis" remains a universal power, and will ring through centuries, so long as our nerves can quiver under the awe of the sublime. And those simple fundamental ideas of the redemption of the individual man by the surrendering of his own will to the will that guides the whole; those images of death and resurrection which express the highest and most thrilling emotions that stir the human breast, when no prose is capable of uttering in cold words the fulness of the heart; those doctrines, finally, which bid us to share our bread with the hungry, and to announce the glad tidings to the poor—they will not for ever disappear, in order to make way for a society which has attained its goal, when it owes a better police system to its understanding, and to its ingenuity the satisfaction of ever-fresh wants by ever-fresh inventions.—(vol. iii., p. 361).

Such is the sentimentalism which Dr. Lange presents to us as the conclusion of this long and laborious work. We must honestly say that it seems to us a most "lame and impotent conclusion." It is "faith as vague as all unsweet." Theism may have its difficulties,
VOL. VII.—NO. I. [*Third Series.*] s

but those of Professor Lange's new theory of the universe are still greater. Catholicism may—

——be hard to flesh and blood,
But nonsense never can be understood.

It is very curious and significant that a thinker who claims and means to be eminently rational, should end in such flat unreason. "Sentimentality" writes the keenest observer of the century, "is a product of Materialism. The Materialist carries in his soul the vague consciousness that all the world is not matter. It is of no use for his limited understanding to show him the material character of everything. His soul instinctively rebels. He is from time to time tormented by the necessity of recognizing in things a purely spiritual origin; and these desires, these vague wants, produce the vague effect which we call sentimentality." Perhaps the chief value of Dr. Lange's work lies in the striking illustration which it affords of these words of Heine.

W. S. L.

History of Ireland: Critical and Philosophical. Vol. I. By STANDISH O'GRADY, ex-Scholar Trinity College, Dublin. Gold Medallist of the Philosophical Society. London: Sampson Low & Co. Dublin: Ponsonby & Co. 1881.

THE author of this instalment of a complete History of Ireland is deeply convinced that there is scarcely in existence a product of the human mind so extraordinary as the Irish annals. "For more than three thousand years before the birth of Christ the stream of Hibernian history flows down uninterrupted, copious, and abundant, between accurately defined banks," king after king and battle after battle; yet, after all, it is but a gorgeous bubble, a mirage and a delusion. It is a creation of the bards, yet not without a certain reality. The legends represent the imagination of the country, and the sort of history which a nation desires to possess. They indicate the ambition and ideals of the people, and, in this way, have a value beyond the tale of actual events and duly recorded deeds. In Ireland especially the mythical period belongs in a certain sense to the historical. It runs into it, and no one can exactly point out the lines of demarcation between the two. It colours it and modifies it in many ways. The Irish bardic literature clings close to rath and cairn; and whereas in the rest of Europe there is not a barrow, dolman, or cist of which the ancient traditional history is recorded, there is hardly one in Ireland of which it is not. Poetic literature constitutes the stumbling-block and the glory of early Irish history: it cannot be rejected and it cannot be retained. Such are the views with which the author approaches the study of the mythology and heroic exploits which in Ireland preceded the dawn of Christianity, and were embodied in the verses of highly honoured and famous bards. We confess that the particulars he enters into respecting the predecessors and progenitors of the Irish gods, the classic gods of ethnic Ireland, and the natural mythology of the Irish, are to our minds more curious than enter-

taining, and more brilliant than useful. The pre-historic kings of Ireland have little interest for us, nor can we easily warm ourselves into sympathy with the chief personages of ancient heroic cycles. Even in subsequent epochs the history of Ireland fills us with continual disappointment. It is delightful and edifying to contemplate the slow growth of a noble people, and to see how the chaos of aimless struggles gradually settled down into the wise and determined action of a nation fulfilling its part in the great national brotherhood of mankind; but, to use the words of this writer himself—

For the historian of Ireland no such delightful task is reserved; not for him to trace the track of the many springs and rivulets, to mark how they converge, and, uniting, form the strong undivided current of the history of a nation moving forward between its firm shores, freighted with the destiny of a single people accomplishing its fate; not for him to limn the slow glorious growth of a nation among the nations of the earth. Beginnings ever beginnings; noble actions without end, that shine and vanish; characters as great as any, but resultless; leadings full of hope leading no whither; flashing glories ever dimmed and blasted, travail and labour unceasing, expectation and resolution ever baffled; through all the centuries, Ireland, as in birth-pangs with many cries, labouring to bring forth the Irish nation, and that nation still unborn. *Tantæ molis erat Romanam condere gentem.*

There were many features in the Irish race, as described in semi-historic bardic tradition, which have characterized them ever since; and it is this circumstance that gives to their ancient literature a value and interest which it would not otherwise possess. Regarded from this point of view, there will be very many, especially among natives of Ireland, who will read with satisfaction the copious details which fill the greater part of this volume. They will glow, perhaps, with delight over the Milesian and Gadelian legends, the invasion of Ireland by the sons of Milesius, the war-goddess Macha, and the "Floruit and Death of Conairy Mór." Here is a brief specimen of the history, if it can be called history, of this period—

Outshining all is the great central figure of Conairy Mór, his countenance reflecting the majesty of a sovereign and the spirituality of a bard. Like the colour of the clouds at sunrise are the changing hues of his vast bratta, and like sundown on a plain of untrodden snow the red and white of his countenance, lit with eyes dark blue, over which droop lashes chafer black. Like the round moon glitters the great brooch upon his breast, thick sown with gems along the edge, and amid his shining yellow hair flashes the refulgence of the royal Ard-Roth. Above his head is a canopy of silver cloth, and at his right hand his sceptre of silver, with which, like eagles from their eyries, he summons forth his long-haired warriors. Beside him lies his sword, a hand's breadth of it escaped from the scabbard, which shoots forth light beyond the light of royal candles, and from it came a voice singing sweeter than the sound of harpers in kings' houses.

In treating of Cuculain, son of Sualtam, and the host of lesser heroes who revolve around him, Mr. O'Grady expresses his opinion of the value of the heroic literature of Ireland, which the Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language is doing its best to make known. An Irish bias, he says, may probably affect him, but he cannot help regarding

the age of the Red Branch Cycle as higher in intrinsic worth than the corresponding ages of Greece. Admitting that there is in Homer, Hesiod, and the Attic poets, a polish and artistic form not to be found in the existing monuments of Irish heroic thought, he believes, notwithstanding, that the gold, the ore itself, is here massier and more pure, the sentiment deeper and more tender, the audacity and freedom more exhilarating, the reach of imagination more sublime, the depth and power of the human soul more fully exhibiting themselves. This is not the conclusion at which we should have arrived after reading the "Pursuit of Diarmuid and Grainne," translated by Mr. O'Grady. The story of "Diarmid and Graney," as it is spelt in the history before us, belongs to the literature surrounding the name of Finn and to the Ossianic Cycle. When Mr. O'Grady arrives at the age of St. Patrick, which is nearly at the end of this volume, his narrative is jejune and fragmentary so far as the apostle of Ireland is regarded. Though he does not differ essentially from the statements generally accepted respecting that great missionary, he lays greater stress on the independence of the church of Ireland than Catholic histories, such as "*Les Petits Bollandistes*," in the "*Vie de Saint Patrice*," and Father Sylvester Malone, would admit. Even Baring Gould, in his life of St. Patrick, after speaking of the mission of the Saint from Rome, about the year 431, adds this testimony:—"The most authentic accounts of his mission agree in stating that, besides having baptized some persons, he erected three churches; and the news of his success, perhaps magnified in its transit, excited such a confident assurance in Rome of his complete conquest of the island to the Cross, that Prosper did not hesitate to say that 'through the exertion of Pope Celestine, Ireland was become a Christian country.'" Acting therefore, as St. Patrick did, as one directly delegated by the Holy See, we incline to believe that Mr. O'Grady has greatly overstated "that self-reliant Irish ecclesiastical organization which Rome and St. Patrick were unable to suppress or to assimilate."

We cannot conclude this notice without referring to the chapter—the last but one in the volume—on the "Introduction of Letters." It comments on that peculiar feature of bardic literature in Ireland, the absence of MSS., and of the art of writing on vellum. The species of writing which it employed was called "Ogham," and consisted of notches cut above, below, and across a horizontal line—always cut, and always inscribed either on timber, stone, or metal. Mr. O'Grady supports the opinion of Dr. Graves that the Ogham is not an independent alphabet, but a cypher with many modes and forms, akin, in its later manifestations, to the Runic inscriptions of the Norse nations. It had a cryptic character, and by its weird and mysterious associations was connected with Druid secrets and spells. We shall be curious to see how this learned writer will treat the subsequent history of Ireland, which will consist henceforward of ascertainable facts, though not devoid of much debatable ground.

Life, Letters, and Diary of Father Henry Fitzsimon, S.J.—Words of Comfort to Persecuted Catholics, written in Exile, anno 1607; Letters from a Cell in Dublin Castle; and Diary of the Bohemian War of 1620. By FATHER HENRY FITZSIMON, Priest of the Society of Jesus. With a Sketch of his Life by EDMUND HOGAN, Priest of the same Society. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1881.

AT the close of the sixteenth century, "the Irish exiles, everywhere dispersed by persecution," petitioned the Pope for more teachers of the Faith, and especially priests of the Society of Jesus, to be sent to labour in "the yellow harvest of Ireland." One of the most remarkable men, sent secretly in answer to this petition, was Father Henry Fitzsimon, whose short miscellaneous writings, letters, and life form the present contribution to the published records of the Irish Province of the Society of Jesus. The researches of the editor brought to light many years ago in Rome, and identified as belonging to Father H. Fitzsimon, the "Diary of the Bohemian War," which had been published in Latin under the names "Candidus Eblanius" and "Constantius Peregrinus." The same energetic research makes especially interesting the sketch of the life of the Jesuit missionary priest, theological disputant, and army chaplain; but the sketch being drawn from the early seventeenth century of altered names and hidden and hunted lives, there are necessarily long lapses of silence and doubtful points, upon which it is hoped light will yet be thrown in a future edition.

Henry Fitzsimon, born in Ireland in 1566, was in boyhood, as he himself says, "inveigled into heresy." He passed some years of school-life in a Puritan, and evidently a Papist-hating, atmosphere at Manchester; for higher studies he went to Oxford; and in the twentieth year of his age he was in Paris, believing himself "to be able to convert to Protestantie any encounterer whatsoever," when, instead, he himself became one of the many converts of the English Jesuit, Father Thomas Darbyshire. The taste for disputation and the knowledge of Protestant argument, which he had desired hitherto to use against all Catholic "encounterers," were now and henceforth turned to the defence of the truth and the conversion of souls with all the insatiable ardour of reparation. He entered the Society of Jesus, because it was the centre of heretical attack. In the same spirit, when, in Dublin, his opponents shirked meeting his challenges, he willingly allowed himself to be seized and imprisoned, "that the ministers might know where to find him," and be tempted to accept his challenge. Before his imprisonment he had laboured with fearless publicity and with immense success; but his five years in Dublin Castle were likewise an apostolate. Five years of gloomy incarceration, with manifold sufferings heaped upon him by the hatred of his enemies, could not daunt his desire to seize every chance of winning souls or of defeating with confusion the teachers of false doctrine. He was ever ready to break a lance with any comer, for his Master's honour. Written challenges sometimes brought the paid dignitaries of the new Church to public contest; at other times

they were arrested by his famous "stentorian voice" sounding from his cell. In consequence of this unbroken spirit, and the almost fierce bitterness of argument with which he condemned the men whom he knew to be bartering false doctrine for hire, there was amongst the Protestant ministers an angry dread of the imprisoned champion, and within the prison walls a jealous hatred, which brought upon him harder treatment than was suffered by any other prisoner—a terrible avowal of his own, when we remember the chains, starvation, and loathsome lodging which Dublin Castle bestowed on others whose sorrows were more fully recorded than his. But probably his hardest prison treatment, and the suffering before which all others paled, was the incident told briefly in one of his letters:—

The governor of the prison has been my deadly enemy, and has often plotted against my life. He is generally considered a bad enemy and a worse friend. For three years he watched most intently to catch me celebrating Mass. At last, on the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul, he rushed in on me just as I was ending the *Pater Noster* of the Mass. I saved the Sacred Host from the sacrilegious wretch; but he wrested the chalice from me, and the Divine Blood was sprinkled all about the cell. He took also the vestments. My conscience tells me that I had omitted nothing to prevent such a horrid sacrilege. But the cunning of the man who lies in wait is greater than all possible precautions. Through the malignity of this man, it is very difficult for anyone to speak with me. He has surrounded me with the most cruel guards and spies that his malice could find out; nevertheless, by the Divine help, I have, in the space of one month, brought back to the bosom of the Church seven Protestants, one of whom is my head warder.

At last his imprisonment was, by royal grant, exchanged for a sentence of banishment, and for a space of more than twenty-five years he was one of the many Irish priests whose decree of exile from their own country turned to a decree of blessing, grace, and light of learning, for the countries that received them. At one time we find him seeking in a plague-stricken city the death of a martyr of charity, since martyrdom for faith had been denied him. At another, he is acting as chaplain to the army of Bucquoi, sent to quell the Bohemian rising; and there is a wonderful seventeenth-century character traced in the Bucquoi of his diary—the blunt, brave, and withal pious-minded soldier in command of unpaid troops athirst for pillage, and by that very command forced into a rule of relentless justice and vigilance. In the year 1630 Father Henry Fitzsimon returned by stealth from his exile to wear out his age, for yet more than a decade of years, in a hidden ministry in his own land. He had collected Irish records and the names of Irish saints from many a foreign library, and it was for his own persecuted race that he dared death to the last. The apostolate from cabin to cabin, by bog and mountain path—always under the shadow of the halter to which he had been condemned in Dublin—finally proved too arduous for his waning life. He died at an advanced age, peacefully among his fellow members of the Society.

We heartily welcome the present record of this strong and fiery character and long career of missionary work. It is meant for popular reading, as we may judge from the translations of Latin, and the

modern interpretations of old spelling; and, besides the history of the central figure, there is in the letters a large amount of minute illustration of that age of persecution which we can never know too well. If we may offer a suggestion as to the printing of future editions, there are passages where changes of type, or some other clear distinction, would save the reader from the risk of confounding the editor's text with the extracts and letters.

Die eucharistische Wandlung und die Epiklese der griechischen und orientalischen Liturgien. Von Dr. JOSEPH FRANZ. Würzburg: Leo Wörl. 1880. (Eucharistic Transubstantiation and the Epiklesis of Greek and Oriental Liturgies.)

THE author, who is superior of the clerical seminary of the diocese of Würzburg, has for his object in this work to establish the doctrine that transubstantiation in the Mass depends exclusively on the words of consecration. He refutes, first, the schismatical Greeks, who suppose that transubstantiation is not accomplished by the sole pronouncement of those words, but also requires, either after or before them, an epiklesis (ἐπικαλέω), or invocation of the Holy Ghost. Secondly, he argues against those Catholic theologians who, principally before the Council of Trent, whilst fully attaching to the words spoken by the priest the power of consecrating, nevertheless require a prayer of the Church, or epiklesis, and, in establishment of their opinion, appeal to the Roman liturgy, or canon. Dr. Franz is very successful in vindicating the common opinion of theologians. His arguments are drawn from the narrative of the Gospels, the Fathers of the Church, the Scholastics, the Councils, the Decree for the Armenians, the liturgical books of the Roman Church, and last, but not least, from the Oriental liturgies. Chapter VIII., in which the Oriental liturgies are examined, is perhaps the most elaborate and instructive. We fully agree with the author in calling them "auriferous," since they testify to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and convey to every priest the most sublime idea of the noble office entrusted to him by the Church. We sincerely wish this learned treatise many and attentive readers.

A Manual of Hindu Pantheism. The Vedāntasāra. Translated, with Copious Annotations, by Major G. A. JACOB, Bengal Staff Corps, Inspector of Army Schools. (In Trübner's Oriental Series.) London: Trübner & Co.

HINDU philosophy, however interesting and important in itself (and of its interest and importance there can be no question), is a subject which probably lies outside the studies of most. So that, for the benefit of the general reader, it may not be useless to explain that there are six schools of it, known as—1. Nyāya: said "to represent its sensational aspect, as treating the external as a solid reality and having a pointed regard to the fact of the five senses;" 2. Vaiseshika: the Atomic School, teaching the existence of a transient world composed of aggregations of eternal

atoms; 3. Sânkya, which is essentially Atheistic, although it is not, by the way, as Victor Cousin asserts, pure materialism; 4. Yoga: a theistic development of Sânkya; 5. Pûrva-Mimânsa; and 6. Uttara-Mimânsa—the Prior and Posterior Mimânsa: two schools, the ostensible object of both which is “to teach the art of reasoning, with the express purpose of aiding the interpretation of the Vedas;” and both which are included in the general term Vedânta. “The main doctrine of the Vedânta,” as Mr. Davies tells us in his “Hindu Philosophy,” “is that there is, in reality, only one existence. It teaches a-dvaita, or non-dualism, as decidedly as Schelling and Hegel. All things visible or invisible are only forms of one Eternal Essence (το ἓν). The basis of the system is, therefore, a pure Pantheism. In its later development this system denies the existence of matter or material forms, as objective realities. Visible things are only appearances, a kind of mirage, called mâyâ (illusion).”

So much as to the Hindu schools of philosophy in general, and, in particular, as to the Vedânta, of which the Vedântasâra is sometimes called the essence. Indeed, it is expressly presented to us by its author as such, in his initial Section:—

“Having saluted my preceptor who, for his having got rid of the notion of duality, is significantly named Adwayânanda, I will now propound the essence of the Vedânta, according to my conception of it.”

It is, in fact, in the Vedântasâra that the old Vedânta received its final form—the form in which it still influences Hindu thought; and as Major Jacob truly remarks: “If the people of India can be said to have any religion at all, apart from mere caste observances, it will be found in the Vedânta philosophy, the leading tenets of which are known to some extent in every village.” Hence the extreme importance of it to all who would understand the mind of the Indian people, especially to Christian missionaries, for whose special benefit this volume is stated to have been compiled. The Vedântasâra teaching, we may observe, in conclusion, has thus been summed up by M. Barth, in his interesting work noticed by us in the present number of this Review: “In this system the finite world does not exist; it is the production of the Mâyâ, of the deceptive magic of God, a mere spectacle where all is illusion—theatre, actors, and piece alike; a ‘play’ without purpose, where the Absolute plays with himself; the ineffable and the inconceivable, is the only real.”

Social History of the Races of Mankind. Fifth Division: Aramæans.

By A. FEATHERMAN. London: Trübner. 1881.

MR. FEATHERMAN, as it would appear, proposes to write the *Social History of the Races of Mankind* in ten volumes, of which the present is put forward as a specimen. It is a great undertaking, and we must say that the book before us does not raise a favourable presumption as to the author's capacity for it. In one quality, indeed, which is not to be despised, although by itself inade-

quate, he does not appear to be deficient. Thus does he write of his preparations and his enterprise :—

Ten years of constant application have thus far been devoted to the collection of materials, and this time has been passed in the best libraries of Europe and America, where the most authentic authors who have written in any of the languages of the civilized world have been examined, either in the original or in translations. The authorities have been thoroughly studied; the facts have been selected with critical discernment, and no doubtful or incredible statements are admitted in the text unless controverted in a footnote.

Now, self-confidence is an excellent thing, as we have said, in its way, and when supported by adequate grounds. But, unfortunately, the 650 pages which Mr. Featherman puts before us, by no means bear out his attribution to himself of thorough study, critical acumen, and accurate diagnosis. No doubt he has read a great number of authors, and filled many note-books, the contents of which he serves up to the universe without much nicety of discrimination.

The Quatrains of Omar Khayyám. Translated into English Verse by E. H. WHINFIELD, M.A., late of the Bengal Civil Service. (In Trübner's Oriental Series.) London: Trübner. 1881.

OMAR Khayyám, the tent-maker, is, as all students of Persian literature know—and a good many who are not students of Persian literature also know—a somewhat enigmatical personage. What is certain about him is, that he was born in the latter half of the eleventh century of our era, and died in the first quarter of the twelfth; and that he enjoyed great reputation in his own time, both as a man of science and a man of letters, "The King of the Wise," "The Paragon of his Age," being titles commonly conferred on him. As to his creed, philosophical or religious, there is the greatest divergence of opinion. M. Nicolas, who has edited his Quatrains in the original (the only one of his works which has been preserved, save certain mathematical treatises) is positive that he gave himself up with passion *à l'étude de la philosophie des Soufis* (Pref. p. xiii.). Von Hammer, on the other hand, is as firmly assured that he was "a Freethinker," and a great opponent of Súfism. However that may be, it is beyond question that he was a poet of no mean order. What Mr. Whinfield justly calls "a brilliant translation" of a hundred and one of his Quatrains was given to the world some years ago by Mr. Fitzgerald. Mr. Whinfield, in the present volume, translates two hundred and three of them. We cannot say that he is so brilliant as his predecessor, but, on the whole, he adheres more closely to the original. We give a few specimens of his verses. Each stanza, or tetrastich, we should note, is an independent poem :—

CIII.

Nor you nor I can read our destiny,
To that dark riddle we can find no key.
They talk of you and me behind the veil,
But when the veil is lifted, where are we?

CLIX.

The world, a hollow pageant, we should deem,
 For wise men know things are not what they seem.
 Be of good cheer, and drink, and so shake off
 These vain delusions of a baseless dream.

CXXXVI.

The world is baffled in its search for Thee,
 Wealth cannot find Thee; no, nor poverty.
 Thou'rt very near us, but our ears are stopped,
 Our eyes are blinded that we may not see.

The Religions of India. By A. BARTH, Member of the Société Asiatique of Paris. Authorized Translation, by the Rev. J. Wood, Edin. (In Trübner's Oriental Series.) London: Trübner. 1881.

THIS volume is an expansion of an article contributed two years ago by the learned author to the "Encyclopédie des Sciences Religieuses," published in Paris under the editorship of Professor Lichtenberger, and is intended to be "a *résumé*, as faithful and realistic as possible, of the latest results of inquiry in all provinces of the vast domain" which it embraces. The merit of the work has been emphatically recognized by the most authoritative Orientalists both in this country and on the Continent of Europe. And Messrs. Trübner have done well in adding it to their Oriental Series. It is, of course, written rather for the general reader than the specialist; it is, indeed, expressly called by the author "an elementary work." But probably there are few Indianists (if we may use the word) who would not derive a good deal of information from it, and especially from the extensive bibliography provided in the notes. It is impossible for us in the space to which we are here restricted to enter upon a detailed survey of M. Barth's book. But one point to which we may specially direct attention is his view of the Vedas. Differing from many—indeed, from the majority—of scholars, he fails to see in the Rig Veda "that quality of primitive natural simplicity usually ascribed to it." Nay, even the Hymns do not appear to him "to show the least trace of popular derivation." On the contrary, he is "inclined to believe that they emanate from a narrow circle of priests, and that they reflect a somewhat singular view of things." And he further observes:—

Not only can I not accept the generally received opinion that Vedic and Aryan are synonymous terms; I am even not at all sure to what extent we are right in speaking of a Vedic people. Not that communities did not then worship the gods of the Veda, but I doubt very much if they regarded them as they are represented in the Hymns, any more than that they afterwards sacrificed to them in community after the rites prescribed in the Brāhmanas. If there is any justice in these views, it is evident that a literature such as this will only embrace what is within the scope of a limited horizon, and will have authoritative weight only in regard to things in a more or less special reference, and

that the negative conclusions especially which may be deduced from such documents must be received with not a little reservation. A single instance, to which I limit myself, will suffice for illustration. Suppose that certain hymns of the tenth book of the Rig-Veda—a book which the majority of critics look upon with distrust—had not come down to us, what would we learn from the rest of the collection respecting the worship of the *manes* of the departed? We might know that India paid homage to certain powers called Pitris, or Fathers, but we could not infer from that, any more than from the later worship of the *Mâtris*, or Mothers, this worship of ancestors, of spirits of the dead, which, as the comparative study of the beliefs, customs, and institutions of Greece and Rome shows us, was nevertheless from the remotest antiquity one of the principal sources of public and private right, one of the bases of the family and the civic community. I am therefore far from believing that the Veda has taught us everything on the ancient social and religious condition of even Aryan India; or that everything there can be accounted for by reference to it. Outside of it I see room not only for superstitious beliefs, but for real popular religions, more or less distinct from that which we find in it; and on this point we shall arrive at more than one conclusion from the more profound study of the subsequent period. We shall perhaps find that, in this respect also, the past did not differ so much from the present as might at first appear; that India has always had, alongside of its Veda, something equivalent to its great Sivaite and Vishnuite religions, which we see in the ascendant at a later date, and that these anyhow existed contemporaneously with it for a very much longer period than has till now been generally supposed.—Pref. p. xv.

As we have said, this is not the generally received view, but it has the support of many high authorities; among whom, we may remark, is Professor Tiele, of Leyden.

Der Prophet Ezechiel erklärt. Von Dr. RUDOLF SMEND, Professor der Theologie in Bael. Mit 8 Holzschnitten und einem lithographirten Plan. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel. 1880.
(*The Prophet Ezechiel explained.* By Dr. RUDOLF SMEND, Theological Professor at Basle. With eight woodcuts and a lithographic plan. Leipsic: Published by S. Hirzel. 1880.)

WE cannot help expressing the debt of personal gratitude which we owe to this book. In many respects Ezechiel is a difficult author; his style abounds in grammatical irregularities, and the Hebrew text is in many places evidently corrupt. After all the work of commentators, differences of opinion and uncertainty on the meaning of many passages will remain; but this need not hinder us from acknowledging how carefully and how well Dr. Smend has done his work. After a diligent perusal of his book, we have not found one word in his commentary wasted—(indeed it is surprising how much matter he has compressed into 400 pages)—scarcely a sentence that is obscure and no single difficulty in the text passed by altogether or even evaded. The grammatical part of the commentary is extremely accurate, and, with regard to the criticism of the text, Dr. Smend seems to us to attain the mean between the rashness of Hitzig and the ultra-conservatism of Keil. We say nothing of

Dr. Smend's theory on the relation of Ezechiel to the Levitical law, because this part of the subject could not be discussed to any purpose within the limits at our disposal. But we hope the readers of this review will excuse us, if we follow a line which we have often pursued on similar occasions, and take the opportunity which this new commentary offers us of saying something on the position and characteristics of the prophet himself.

He was, as everybody knows, a prophet of the Exile. In the year 596 B.C. he was carried off to Babylon with King Joachin, and from that time onwards he lived in a colony of exiles by the river Chebar in the Tel Abib. His prophecies possess a special interest because Ezechiel himself habitually appends the dates to each separate prophecy. This enables us to fix exactly the period of that disastrous history through which he lived corresponding to each single prophecy. He was a priest, and very likely he had officiated in the temple; and he was in the very midst of his prophetic activity when the news reached him that the city had been "struck" and the temple destroyed. He dates the first of his prophecies in 592, the last (see xxix. 17) in 570. From cap. i.—xxiv. he sets the old Israel before us as it perishes and passes away, in cap. xxv.—xxxiii. we see God's judgments falling on the heathen, in xxxiii.—xlvi. the rise of the new and better Israel.

It is this position of Ezechiel among the exiles which separates him from his predecessors in the prophetic office, and fills him with ideas different from theirs, so that he marks a new era in that gradual revelation of God's character and designs which is unfolded in the Old Testament. Earlier prophets, even Jeremias, had stood between the people, as a unity, and God. Ezechiel could not do so in the same sense. The nation, as a nation, existed no longer, for only a miserable remnant was left in Juda, and even among the exiles Ezechiel for a time could find no hearing. He could not appeal to King or Court, or speak to the people as they gathered for God's worship at the temple, or make himself felt as a power in the policy of the state. But the "hand of God was strong upon him," and speak he must, "whether they would hear or whether they would forbear." Accordingly, he becomes what none of the prophets had been, at least, in anything like the same degree—viz., the pastor* of individual souls. He is a preacher who addresses individuals: one by one he tries to mould the souls of the exiles among whom he moves, and so to form a new and regenerate Israel which will once more inherit the land.

Hence it was given to Ezechiel more than to any other prophet to insist on the great doctrines of individual responsibility and the account each soul must render singly to its God. He insists on the responsibility of the pastor and on the dread reckoning which will be exacted from him if he feeds himself and neglects to feed the

* We use the word "pastor" because it accurately describes the functions which Ezechiel attributes to himself as prophet. But he himself follows the old use, and employs the actual word "shepherd" to describe the kingly office.

sheep, if he allows souls to perish from the want of warning and admonition. No modern spiritual book, not even the New Testament itself, speaks in more awful or in more touching language on the responsibilities attached to the cure of souls. "The wicked will die in his sin, and his blood from thy hand I will require" (iii. 18 *et passim*). No less emphatically does Ezechiel insist on the responsibilities of free will, the issues which proceed from its use or abuse. Judgment comes not on the nation only, but on persons. No piety of fathers or forefathers, no personal piety in the past, if it has been abandoned for impiety in the present, will avail before God. "All souls are mine, the soul that sinneth, it will die" (xviii. 4) But there is another way in which Ezechiel shows himself a true pastor. He is not content with setting life and death before his hearers. No; his tenderness and true love of souls break forth from the midst of his announcements of God's inexorable law. It is no hard reign of law which he preaches, for behind the law there is the lawgiver, a compassionate and loving God, who pleads with souls and entreats them to take pity on themselves. "Make yourselves a new heart and a new spirit, and why will ye die, O house of Israel? Since I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth—it is the oracle of the Lord Jehovah—turn ye and live" (xviii. 31, 32). He lifts up the people when a true sense of sin was driving them to despair. "Thus ye have said and so ye speak: surely our rebellions and our sins are upon us and in them we pine away and how shall we live?" But the prophet answers in words of hope and courage, ending in the old pathetic strain. "As I live, it is the oracle of the Lord Jehovah, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but rather that the wicked should turn from his way and live. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways and why will ye die, O house of Israel?" (xxxiii. 11). Even passages like 1 Tim. ii. 4, 2 Pet. iii. 9, do not exceed the sympathy and tenderness—we had almost said, the Christian tenderness—of this old Hebrew prophet, embittered though his life was by the ruin of his nation, by the "rebellious house" in the midst of which he lived, by the blow which struck him in his own family life, when in a moment God took from him his wife, "the desire of his eyes," and added the strict command, "thou shalt not lament and thou shalt not weep, and thy tears shall not flow; sigh in stillness" (xxiv. 16). We do not envy him who can read without emotion the history of that brave and honest, and tender and gentle heart.

We have spoken of Ezechiel in his special character as the pastor of souls. But of course we do not for a moment forget that he was, in the highest sense, a true prophet, filled with belief in the destinies of Israel and the coming of the Messianic kingdom. The old Israel was to pass away; the hopes of those who lingered in Palestine were to end in disaster, nor was there any salvation for the exiles if they continued impenitent (cap. xi.). But on two critical occasions Ezechiel showed where his true hope lay. At the former, King Sedecias was endeavouring to escape from his position as the vassal of Babylon by a treacherous alliance with Pharaoh Hophra of Egypt. Ezechiel condemns both the morality and the prudence

of this crooked policy. "He (Sedecias) hath despised the oath to break the covenant, and behold he hath given his hand (in surety); all this hath he done; he shall not escape" (xvii. 18). But will the promises made to David fail? Far from it. God will take from the "crown of the cedar"—i.e., from the royal house of David—and place it on a high mountain, and all birds of the air will find their shelter under it. "I the Lord have spoken, and I will do" (xvii. 22-24).

The second crisis was more terrible still. The prophet sees Nabuchodonosor standing at the point where two roads diverge, and uncertain whither he will send his destroying hosts, to Ammon or Jerusalem, each of them in rebellion against him. He consults his household gods, gazes at the livers of the victims, shakes his divin- ing arrows. Then suddenly the prophet sees the lot with the name of Jerusalem upon it leap into Nebuchodonosor's right hand; the fate of the city is determined, and Sedecias is to meet his doom. "The crown and the mitre" are to pass away, and the things that have been are to be no longer. But amidst the crash of empires the promise of the Messiah remains indestructible, and the announce- ment of His advent flashes forth like a gleam of light amidst the darkness. "Ruin, ruin, ruin will I bring upon it until He comes to whom the government belongs, and to Him will I give it."

Here we had intended to end, but we will add one word more, which may serve to connect the beginning of this little essay with the end. We began by speaking of Ezechiel as a pastor of souls, and it is not without significance that he looks forward to the Messiah, the Son of David, as the Good Shepherd. "I will raise up one shep- herd, and he will feed them, David my servant. He will feed them, and he will be their shepherd" (xxxiv. 23). "David my servant shall be their prince for ever, and I will make with them a covenant of peace, an eternal covenant shall be with them" (xxxvii. 25).

W. E. ADDIS.

A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and some other Syntactical Questions. By S. R. DRIVER, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1881.

WE welcome with the greatest satisfaction this new edition of Mr. Driver's admirable treatise. We have in English the Grammar of Kalisch, which is undoubtedly a work of great excel- lence; but though it furnishes a most careful record of the facts in the Hebrew tongue, it does next to nothing for scientific theory, and it is much more complete and thorough in the accidence than in the syntax. The difficulties of Ewald's larger Grammar keep many students from reading it through, and besides, true as it is that no intelligent scholar can fail to derive new light and interest from Ewald's work, this great master is often arbitrary, and inattentive in his presentation of details. Mr. Driver's book is modest and thorough, and most lucid in style. It is one of those rare books which treat of language in such a way as to make its study a real instru- ment of philosophical cultivation. The instances of linguistic use

are well chosen and given in great abundance, and, having verified a very large number of them, we are able to testify to the care that has been taken in insuring correctness in the references. The treatise is perfectly within the reach of any one who has mastered a good Hebrew Grammar and read with care a considerable part of the Hebrew Bible. At the same time it is sure to stimulate its readers to further research, and it contains many interesting facts derived from comparison of the cognate languages. Mr. Driver has brought wide and accurate reading, laborious and independent investigation, to bear upon his subject. He is always master of his learning, never mastered by it. He has carefully elaborated his method and his style, and, as a consequence of all this, has produced a book which is nearly perfect in its kind.

W. E. ADDIS.

The Great Commentary of Cornelius à Lapide. Translated by THOMAS W. MOSSMAN, B.A., Assisted by various Scholars. S. Matthew's Gospel, chapters xxii. to xxviii.; S. Mark's Gospel, complete. London: John Hodges. 1881.

IT was a happy thought of Mr. Mossman when he resolved to translate into English the excellent "Commentary" of Cornelius à Lapide. There is no doubt that the work of Cornelius à Lapide stands by itself. It is the most erudite, the richest, and altogether the completest commentary on the Holy Scriptures which has ever been written. We do not deny some merit to the modern school of textual criticism. We are ready to allow that such men as Philippi, Keil, Delitzsch, Lange, and Kalisch have made valuable contributions to Scripture literature and criticism. But they have given us nothing of what we find in Cornelius à Lapide. And as for our English Protestant commentaries, they are only a reproduction of the dry, hard-headed, unctious criticism of the Germans. If we want to see what depths of spiritual meaning, what riches of moral teaching, what sweetness, what unction there is to be found in the words of the Holy Scripture, we must go to Cornelius à Lapide. There, above all, must the preacher go who wants to find matter ready to his hand for expounding the Word of God. He will be amazed to see the wealth of spiritual thoughts, the abundance of suggestive matter which the reading of a few pages will open out to him. There he will find, too, the choicest and best thoughts of the greatest of the Fathers who have commented on the Holy Scriptures. A passage from one of them will sometimes flash a light upon his mind which will be quite a new revelation to him. The translation—which, by the way, is not all from the hands of Mr. Mossman, though he makes himself responsible for all—is, on the whole, very good and faithful. It is, for the most part, a close rendering into English of the original. But we notice here and there some lameness and inaccuracy. We take, for instance, a passage in p. 178 of the volume before us. In rendering the words, "*species intentionales opticas sive visivas*," the translator

leaves out altogether the word "intentionales," possibly because he may not understand the meaning of this scholastic term. Then, again, the translation of the following sentence is peculiar, not to say imperfect:—"Respondeo, pari modo Christi corpus in Eucharistia accipit spiritalem modum existendi, ut quasi spiritus spiritualiter sit in puncto hostiæ." Mr. Mossman renders this passage thus:—"I reply, in like manner the Body of Christ in the Eucharist assumes a spiritual mode of existence, so that, as a spirit, it should be spiritually in the very small portion of the Host." The original is clear enough, but the translation of the latter part of the sentence is nearly, if not quite unintelligible. "As a spirit" is ambiguous. Then, why should "sit" be translated "should be"? And "in puncto hostiæ" does not mean "in the very small portion of the Host," but "in any part of the Host." The sentences that immediately follow must have been very imperfectly understood by the translator. The word "intentionales" is here rendered by "objective;" and the words "inherent enim corpori, scilicet aëri," are translated in this way, "for they are inseparable from corporeal entities, such as the atmosphere." This is certainly not the meaning of the clause; but, "they (the species) inhere in body, that is, in the air."

This is the third volume which Mr. Mossman has published; it completes SS. Matthew and Mark's Gospels. Other two volumes, containing the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John, are in course of preparation. The former of these we may expect in a short time. Our best thanks are due to Mr. Mossman for having undertaken to give us, in clear, terse, and vigorous English, the invaluable work of the prince of Scripture commentators.

Under the Aspens, Lyrical and Dramatic. By EMILY PFEIFFER.
London: Kegan Paul & Co.

THE volume before us has been made up for the ostensible purpose of bringing out the author's first attempt at dramatic writing. The attempt, as we learn from the preface, "in the way of benefiting by managerial help," was unsuccessful. We fear the appeal to the literary public will be hardly more encouraging. The history of past poetic attempts to found a tragedy on contemporary incidents has not been encouraging, and Mrs. Pfeiffer must surely have had serious misgivings when she entered upon a work where so many others failed before her. The drama, "The Wynnes of Wynhavod," is disappointing under every aspect. Modern society talk, with its ease and *nuances* of expression, marches most lamely when swathed in majestic heroics. The incidents of the plot are crude, not to say coarse, the characters extravagantly drawn, the agonized situations spring up too suddenly. It is a pity that Mrs. Pfeiffer has not been content with the legitimate triumphs that she has won in her lyrics and sonnets. She has a mastery of true poetic diction, a power of representing our common emotions under graceful and striking imagery, and no mean skill in versification. With these

gifts she must be content. One or two of the sonnets in this volume, however, cannot fail to arouse painful feelings. It is never a pleasant thing to find ladies "prattling atheism"; but when we find an author of such unmistakable gifts as Mrs. Pfeiffer lending her high poetic gifts to the dressing up of such poor stuff as the following, we close the volume with a little stronger feeling than that of sadness.

LEARN OF THE DOG.

"Stern law of every mortal lot
Which man, proud man, finds hard to bear,
And builds himself I know not what
Of second life I know not where."

I.

O Heart of man! be humble, nor disdain
The latest gospel preached beneath the sun;
Learn of the brute how thou, when life is done,
May loose its bonds, and cease, and know no pain.
Learn of the dog to die—nay, that were vain;
Death followeth in the steps of life, and none
Win more of Death, the Shadow, than they won
Of Life in years of travail and of strain.

II.

Learn of the dog to *live*, if thou wouldst find
His peace in death; for him the silent spheres
Keep their long watch unchallenged overhead;
Know as he knows; love as he loves his kind,
Unweave the web of human toil and tears;
Die like a dog, when thought and love are dead.

Dissertationes selectæ in Historiam Ecclesiasticam. Auctore BERNARDO JUNGMAN. Tomus I. 1880. Tomus II. 1881. Ratisbonæ, Pustet.

DR. JUNGMAN, formerly professor in the seminary of Bruges, published, a few years ago, a series of tracts on dogmatical theology, which, by their arrangement, sound doctrine, and admirable clearness of language, won for themselves high esteem and a very wide circulation. Since then, Dr. Jungmann has been appointed professor in the Catholic university of Louvain, where he lectures on ecclesiastical history. Hence the *Dissertationes* above named. The first volume deals with the following topics—important ones as will be seen at a glance:—1. *De Sede Romanâ S. Petri Principis Apostolorum* (pp. 27-108). 2. *De Romanis Pontificibus sæculi primi et secundi* (p. 108-173). 3. *De opere quod inscribitur, Philosophumena* (pp. 183-273). 4. *De S. Cypriani gestis et doctrinis atque de Romanis Pontificibus ipsi cœvis* (pp. 263-358). 5. *De ortu Arianismi ac de concilio Nicæno* (358-453). We have not, therefore, before us a complete history of the first and second centuries of the Church, but the most important questions concerning the history of that period brought into prominence and fully discussed. It does great credit to Dr. Jungmann that he has selected those very

topics which in our days were once again made conspicuous during the Vatican Council in order to attack the Pope's supreme authority. After an introduction on the character of the several epochs of ecclesiastical history and the principal historians, the author discusses S. Peter's stay at Rome. In reading this dissertation it struck us that Dr. Jungmann does not lay due stress on the splendid discoveries of De Rossi—the Christian inscriptions and paintings in the Catacombs which bear so ample testimony to S. Peter's primacy. One of the best dissertations of the first volume seems to be the discussion on the value, and the author, of the work attributed to the third century and commonly styled "*Philosophumena*." Dr. Jungmann is very successful in refuting the foul accusations brought against Pope Callistus, and also in disproving the authorship of S. Hippolytus. A good many Catholic authors in Germany were formerly inclined to support the authorship of Hippolytus, but at the present moment it is denied, and other names, amongst them Tertullian's, are mentioned in connection with the slanderous book. The testimony of the Fathers and other ecclesiastical authors, undoubtedly disproves any connection between Hippolytus and the *Philosophumena*. Let me point in confirmation to a hitherto unknown epitaph of S. Damasus on S. Hippolytus, recently discovered by De Rossi, in a codex belonging to the Imperial library of St. Petersburg (*Bulletino di Archeologia Cristiana* 1881, pp. 1–52). This codex, formerly in possession of the great French abbey of Corbey and St. Germain-des-Près, was written in the eighth century. Damasus wrote the epitaph for S. Hippolytus's basilica, in the Via Tiburtina.

Hypolitus fertur premerent cum jussa tyranni,
 Presbyter in scisma semper mansisse Novati
 Tempore quo gladius secuit pia viscera matris
 Devotus Christo peteret cum regna piorum
 Quæsisset populus ubinam procedere possit
 Catholicam dixisset fidem sequerentur ut omnes
 Sic noster meruit confessus ut esset
 Hæc audita refert Damasus probat omnia Christus.

A fragment of the original inscription is still preserved in the floor of the Lateran basilica, where De Rossi pointed it out thirty years ago. S. Damasus in this inscription declares S. Hippolytus to have followed the schism of Novatus, but before being put to death to have returned to the Church and exhorted all other people to follow his example. The facts referred to by Damasus are fully established by De Rossi to belong to the epoch from 251–258, rather than to the period of 218–222, when S. Callistus governed the Church and the *Philosophumena* were brought out. Hence S. Hippolytus, whom De Rossi identifies with the saint of this recently-discovered epitaph, cannot be the author of the *Philosophumena*. The eminent Roman archaeologist puts forth this opinion with great reserve; but new light will be shed on these intricate questions by the excavation of the basilica of S. Hippolytus, which is to be proceeded with next winter. Suffice it for me to have pointed to De Rossi's judi-

cious dissertation, which not only amply testifies to his immense learning, but also unanswerably shows that the Hippolytus question is still an open one.

Dr. Jungmann's second volume contains the following dissertations:—1. De Arianismi fatiis ac de supposito lapsu Liberii, R. P. (pp. 1-84); 2. De Arianismi decrementis ac de Concilio CPTano. I. (p. 84-137); 3. De abolito per Nestorium Officio Presbyteri poenitentiarum (pp. 137-189); 4. De Concilio Ephesino (pp. 189-258); 5. De Concilio Chalcedonensi (pp. 258-314); 6. De tribus capitulis (pp. 314-383); 7. De causa Honorii Romani Pontificis. In this part we meet with the same thoroughness as in the first volume. The dissertations on the two Popes, Liberius and Honorius, deserve special praise. As to Liberius we may be permitted again to refer to De Rossi's *Bulletino* (1876, p. 16-19), where an important inscription is explained, fully testifying to the esteem in which he was held by the Roman Senate, just at the time when he was opposed to Felix. De Rossi (p. 19) remarks, "E perciò i monumenti, che alludono a quella devozione ed ubbidienza, hanno pregio notabile, e debbono esser tenuti a conto dai cultori delle controversie di storia ecclesiastica." We gladly, therefore, recommend Dr. Jungmann's volumes, and wish them a wide circulation; they will be specially welcome to those members of the clergy who have been his disciples.

BELLESHEIM.

Controversiarum de Divina Gratia Liberique Arbitrii Concordia Initia et Progressus. Enarravit GERARDUS SCHNEEMANN, S.J. Accedunt opuscula inedita Leonardi Lessii et Josephi Kleutgen, ejusdem Societatis theologorum, atque exemplum phototypicum autographæ Pauli V. relationis. Friburgi: Herder. 1881.

OF late years the doctrine held by the Society of Jesus as to the concurrence of Divine grace and the liberty of human will has had to endure in Germany, as well as outside, several severe attacks. Hitherto the Jesuits have kept silence. Even the eminent defender of Catholic doctrine against the more prominent errors of our time, Father Kleutgen, has refrained from meeting any of the attacks against "*scientia media*." Only in 1880 Father Schneemann, favourably known by numerous writings on the *Encyclical* of 1864, and on Pope Honorius, and as editor of the bulky collection of the "*Concilia recentiora*," has broken silence and undertaken to defend himself and the Society. His German works on the important controversy between Jesuits and Thomists are now brought out in Latin, enriched by many important documents gathered from the Brussels and Roman libraries.

In addition to an exhaustive examination of authorities, Father Schneemann has given a very accurate history of the discussions held in Rome in the time of Clement VIII. and Paul V. Special thanks must be given to the author for having inserted the note written by Pope Paul V. in the last session convened in the palace of the

Quirinal, August 28, 1607. There were present the Pope himself and Cardinals Penelli, D'Ascoli, Bianchetto, Bellarmin, Perone (Du Perron), Buffallo, and the Cardinal of St. Eusebio; the well-known and highly-esteemed Cardinal Du Perron, "si sforzo di mostrare, che l'opinione dei Gesuiti era lontana da' Pelagiani con molti lochi di S. Agostino." And the Pope recorded his own opinion about the Jesuits in the following words: "E li Gesuiti son differenti da' Pelagiani li quali ponevano il principio della salute da noi, e loro tengono tutto il contrario"—(pp. 290, 291).

In an appendix (pp. 337-488) appear, besides minor documents, for the first time, the learned "responsio P. Leonardi Lessii ad Antapologiam," by which Lessius vindicated his doctrine against the faculty of Louvain. It is all the more important because Lessius published his views quite independently of and previous to Molina. The second appendix gives the "Votum" of Father Kleutgen on Lessius's doctrine on the inspiration of the Bible. The "Votum" has been enlarged since the Vatican Council, and Father Kleutgen is very successful in vindicating Lessius's doctrine as not in the least affected by the Council (pp. 488-491). We feel sure that Father Schneemann's work, written in clear and elegant Latin, will be welcomed by all Catholic scholars.

Selections from the Household Books of the Lord William Howard, of Nawarthe Castle; with an Appendix containing some of his Papers and Letters, and other Documents, illustrative of his Life and Time. (Publications of the Surtees Society, vol. lxxviii.) Published for the Society by Andrews & Co., Durham; Whitaker & Co., Quaritch, London. Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh. 1878.

PERHAPS some apology is due for this tardy notice of a work of such uncommon interest as the Surtees Society's "Selections from the Household Books of the Lord William Howard." "Belted Will Howard," for this figure of romance is the same man, here represented as he lived and moved amidst most practical surroundings, is, indeed, a name that brings us into a field where many attractive lines converge; the associations of poetry familiar to every reader of Scott, family traditions of the greatest of English houses, immediate relationship to so noble and striking a character as Philip, Earl of Arundel, the Confessor of the Tower. Add to these, social and historical *memorabilia* especially connected with the daily life and manners of a region and time, the Northumberland of the first two Stuart reigns, hitherto but imperfectly known, and now brought out from original domestic records of the most influential and prominent personage of the border counties at that period. Readers who have not made a speciality of such studies, but who can appreciate their value, and the assistance they give to the eye of history, gazing into the past, will find themselves much indebted to the editorial skill and learning which Canon Ornsby has applied in his excellent introduction and notes, and throughout the whole work.

At present we content ourselves with thus indicating a most instructive and ably-handled addition to our sources of information on English antiquity, to which we propose to devote a paper on the next opportunity.

Catholic Sermons. A Series of Sermons on Faith and Morals, appearing every week. Conducted by Rev. J. B. BAGSHAWE. Vol. I., Sermons on the Commandments. Lane & Son, Printers, 310, Strand, London.

WE cannot too highly praise the energy and zeal of Father Bagshawe in attempting to circulate through the kingdom popular instruction on religious truths. We quite agree with him in all that he says in his Introduction on the necessity of taking such instruction to the firesides of the masses, and of not waiting till people come for it. Nothing could be truer and more to the point than what he says regarding the immense power of the press, and of the vigorous use which the enemies of the Church make of it:—

In our own times [he says] the power of the press has been greatly increased. The cheapness of printing and the modern facilities of postage, and, still more, the immense increase of the number of readers, have rendered its power almost irresistible. We feel the effects of it every day. The press is used with grievous effect by the enemies of religion, and also by a vast crowd of religious people, who for our misfortune and theirs are enemies of the Catholic Church. We know only too well the untiring zeal with which the press is used against the Church. What are we to do? The only possible thing to be done is to fight them on their own ground, and with their own weapons, which, with God's grace, it is easy enough to do, if only we will bestir ourselves to do it. It is no use, however, to fight with old-fashioned weapons—to use bows and arrows against the rifles of modern days. We must employ the most efficacious means of putting the faith before mankind, and influencing our brethren, that our age supplies to us; or, we must abandon the conflict, which God forbid!—*Introduction*, p. x.

This is all most true; but Father Bagshawe has undertaken a most difficult task in trying to popularize *sermons*. It is difficult to make sermons popular even with the aid of a musical voice and clear enunciation, and a speaking eye, and graceful gesture, and all the other advantages of a living presence. How much more difficult to make the sermon interesting and popular without the preacher! There was a great deal of meaning in the remark of that great preacher, who, when told that his sermons were about to be printed, said, "Well, you must print *me*, too." In these days of brilliant writing, everything must be well written to have the least chance of being read. Now, Father Bagshawe's "*Sermons*" have many excellent qualities of style; they are clear, methodical, simple, and we may add, for the most part, homely. They lack, perhaps, some other qualities that are needed to make them popular. They might have more illustration, more directness, more brightness, and greater pungency of phrase. But if the assiduous author can induce the people to read them, there is no

doubt that these sermons will afford them solid and useful instruction.

Chronological Notes: containing the Rise, Growth, and Present State of the English Congregation of the Order of St. Benedict, drawn from the Archives of the Houses of the said Congregation, &c. An. 1709.
By DOM BENNET WELDON, O.S.B., a Monk of St. Edmund's, Paris. London: John Hodges. 1881.

THESE "Chronological Notes," now for the first time printed, will doubtless serve the purpose which the Editor desires they should—that of being "a contribution to the history of the Catholic Church in England during the seventeenth century." They will be found valuable *mémoires pour servir*, and are, we can testify, very interesting present reading. Dom Weldon's chief concern has been to trace the fortunes of the English Congregation of Benedictines; and this is as natural as that Br. Foley's "Records" should be chiefly occupied with the fortunes of the Jesuit Missions. But the "Notes" contain besides not a little matter of wider historical interest, and incidentally some interesting details of contemporary life. This volume will take its place with the "Records," the "Douay Diaries," and similar valuable reprints of original "sources" of that truer history of the Church in this country for which we wait.

There is an element of pathos about many pages of these Benedictine records, peculiar to them from the nature of the case. The Fathers of the Society came to a land in which they had as yet no religious traditions. The Order of St. Benedict had been, to use Cardinal Newman's words of the Church, "enthroned in some twenty Sees up and down the broad country;" the old names of Canterbury, and Durham and Winchester that had "gone, and it was sore to part with them," were the names of their own homes, names "in the past greatness" of which they rightly gloried. It is touching, for example, to read, as we here do, of the Benedictine monk, Philip Ellis, preaching in the presence of King James II., and hear him renouncing, in the name of his venerable Order, all title and right to the ancient possessions. They cannot, he says, be now wrested out of the hands of their present possessors and their heirs.

The Church, and in her name, the Supreme Pastor, hath quitted all pretensions, and prays that what she hath loosed upon earth may be loosed in heaven; and that every one concerned may enjoy as quiet a conscience as they do and shall to the end of the world enjoy an undisturbed possession. . . . As for the monks themselves, they also add a separate renunciation of their own. They suppose no judicious person will question their power to do it, more than a conscientious person will question their sincerity that they have actually done it. That ecclesiastical as well as secular corporations and communities can alienate, is certain. And, lest it should be doubted whether they have made use of their power in a case prudence and charity, and even self-preservation so

much require, they again solemnly protest they desire nothing should be restored but their reputation, and to be thought by their countrymen neither pernicious nor useless members to their country.

Dom Weldon's "Notes" do not deal with the period of exile and suppression, but with that of the first attempts at restoration of religion in England. Some interesting and sound remarks, however, on the causes and extent of relaxed monastic discipline in this country prior to the dissolution are given by the editor in his preface. The Notes are chiefly concerned with the century ending with 1709. The writer of them was a son of a Colonel George Weldon, of Swanscombe, near Gravesend, and was born in London in 1674. He was received into the Catholic Church when only thirteen years old, to his mother's great annoyance, by Father Joseph Johnston, a member of the short-lived Royal Benedictine monastery at St. James's Palace in London. Four years later he was clothed, and in due course professed at St. Edmund's, Paris. He never came to work on the English Mission; indeed, was of so retiring and scrupulous a nature, that he never took priest's orders, but lived in the French monasteries to the end, a model of regular observance and virtue, and an assiduous student. He died in 1713, at the age of forty years, four years after the completion of these "Notes," that are themselves an abridgment of two folio volumes of historical memoirs of the English Benedictines.

To trace the perpetuation of the English Congregation of Benedictines, from the pre-Reformation glories, through the dark persecutions of Henry and Elizabeth, on, without break, to the "Union," as it is called, of 1617, with which begins the modern period, if we may so say, of its existence, is the great object of interest with Dom Weldon. The story is almost romantic. The Abbey of Westminster had been re-established under Queen Mary, with the illustrious confessor, Abbot Feckenham, at its head. But, alas! only for a year or two. Queen Elizabeth soon put an end to the attempt. Sanders tells us how the new Queen sent the monks word that they might remain undisturbed at Westminster, praying for her and celebrating service "according to the order of her laws," and that they preferred banishment, seeing no reason, as he quaintly adds, "why they should forsake the rule of St. Bennet to keep that of Calvin." This was the last community in direct line, as one may say, of the English monks of St. Benedict; their dispersion might well seem to scatter to the winds the last hope of their ever reviving. Of the fourteen monks banished that day from the old walls of Westminster no records remain except of three members. Abbot Feckenham died some twenty years later, after much suffering in and out of prison for the Faith's sake. Another monk, Dom William Coppinger, having refused to conform, died soon after in the Tower. The third, Dom Sigebert Buckley, becomes the hero of the story; the last survivor, as far as it is known, of the old English congregation; the "last man" of a cruelly persecuted race. During the reign of Elizabeth Englishmen entered the Benedictine Order in various houses of France, Spain, and Italy. Many of them, as also of the

Secular clergy, or Seminarists, and of the Jesuit Fathers, came over to England during Elizabeth's reign as opportunity allowed; for—

Queen Elizabeth, who, for the excess of a gaudy court, was called in foreign countries the Comedian Queen, gave them, after the twentieth year of her reign, occasion to augment the title of Comedian with that of Tragedian; for Christendom stood astonished at her frequent and cruel exactions of poor Catholic priests ("Notes," p. 35).

The reader must here understand that, by the English Congregation of Benedictines, is meant that branch of the great order which St. Augustine brought over, which was soon "engrafted into the cathedral churches of England, and became a branch of the order, with observances, rules, and traditions peculiar to themselves, adapted to their surroundings and special work." St. Augustine had founded it; St. Wilfrid had "collected in France and Italy the choicest flowers of regular observances and transplanted" them with success into it; St. Bennet Biscop had worked for its perfection, regulating exactly the divine services; St. Dunstan revived it after the devastation of Danish incursions; and a final form was given to it by force of a decree of the Council of Lateran, of 1215, "in compliance with which decree, which extended itself to all kingdoms, the Order of St. Benedict divided itself in England into two provinces, the one of Canterbury, and the other of York, with obligation to keep a Chapter every three years, after the Innocentian form." It was this gradually perfected system, the result of long experience, guarded by laws, strengthened by privileges and favours of the Apostolic See, that Dom Weldon speaks of with so much satisfaction as the English Congregation.

Two Englishmen of the Italian Congregation of Monte Cassino, Fathers Thomas Preston and Anselm Beach (*alias* of Manchester), came over in 1603, and "at Mr. Francis Woodhouse, of Cisson, near Wendham, found the Rev. Dom Sigebert Buckley, whom King James, a few months before, had ordered to be freed from his prison at Fromegham (Framlingham), from which time they "took care of the old man till his happy exit from this world." Some members of the Spanish Congregation next followed into England. They all soon came to the conclusion that "they should, whether they would or no, be a continual impediment to each other, unless they were united into one body," the necessity of their all having only one chief superior being mainly felt. They were inspired—

To lay down whatsoever power else they had separate to receive a joint and larger authority from the ancient English Congregation, which still survived in the person of the Rev. F. Sigebert Buckley, upon whom was devolved, and in whom preserved inviolate, all the privileges of the old English Congregation. And to this they were mightily urged by R. F. Austin Baker, native of the Abergavenny in Wales, a most egregious legist as any of his times.

Through the care of F. Baker, everything was done in legal form; and on the 21st of November, 1607, the venerable old man, Father Sigebert, "at that time, through I know not what occasion [probably, however, because of the late gunpowder-plot], detained in the Gate-

house prison at Westminster," aggregated two members of the old congregation, and afterwards ten more. One of the two first aggregated, who also made his profession on that day into Father Buckley's hands, was Father Edward Maihew, or May, of Dinton, in Wiltshire, and he testifies that old Father Siegbert, "though almost consumed with misery and age, yet enjoyed his sight to the end of his holy work, which done, he became quite blind." Father Buckley died at the age of 93, on the 22nd of February, 1610, and because "the heretics would not let him be buried in the churchyard," two of his brethren had him buried in an old chapel, with regrets that they could not give more honourable resting to "a very good old man, and of great merit, who had endured for the Catholic faith forty years' persecution, always shut up in some prison or other." This aggregation by Father Buckley was approved by Pope Paul V., as the beginning of a complete union of English Benedictines that was finally effected, as we have already said, in 1617, had the seal of Papal approval set upon its constitutions in 1619, and flourishes in the English Church of to-day. All the details of the establishment of that "Union" are narrated in Dom Weldon's notes, under the various years during which the struggle against difficulties and opposition went on. How highly he esteems the aggregation of 1607, these few words sufficiently tell: "In effect it was so happy a beginning that a union without it could never have found place amongst men of such different bodies and pretensions that they scarce ever would have found where to lay the corner stone." The varying fortunes of the monasteries of Douay, Dieulwart, St. Malo, Paris, Valladolid, &c., and of the Benedictine convents of Paris and Cambray, are also noted year by year. The editor has, in the appendix, added a brief sketch and list of prioresses of other convents of English ladies abroad, some of which have been transplanted to their native England, chiefly through the action of the French Revolution. Thus the Priory of Atherstone traces back to that of Our Lady of Good Hope, founded in Paris in 1652; the Abbey of Oulton, near Stone, to that of the Immaculate Conception at Ghent, founded in 1624; and St. Scholastica's, at Teignmouth, to the Abbey of Dunkirk, founded by Dame Mary Knatchbull, in 1662, and for the foundation of which, as Dunkirk then belonged to England, the consent of King Charles II. was asked and obtained.

We have left ourselves no space to speak of many incidents in these pages that are of general interest, as throwing new light on a dark and only recently explored period of the history of English Catholics. We thank the editor—who has not made himself known—for this valuable book. To the members of the ancient Benedictine Order it will doubtless have all the special charm of a family relic, speaking eloquently of a period of struggle to which, for the heroism and self-sacrifices that marked it, they may look back with feelings different, indeed, but as consoling, since God permitted it, as those with which they recall the prior period of wide-spread and peaceful possession. To us who have not that family connection, its pages

have exercised a fascination that will extend, we think, to all who can be touched by a minute and vivid revelation of the details of that past period, so critical to Catholic interests in England.

The Speaker's Commentary. New Testament, Vol. III. Romans to Philemon. London: John Murray. 1881.

IT is said that when Mr. Bright made his famous reference to the Cave of Adullam, many honourable members were puzzled, not knowing that it was a Scriptural allusion. Some suspected that he was referring to "Aladdin" and the "Arabian Nights." Perhaps it was this that led the then Speaker, Mr. Denison, to suggest the Commentary called after his name, to serve as a sort of Scriptural Hansard for the use of Members of Parliament. However that may be, the work is a noble defence of Sacred Scripture against the attacks of Rationalists. The present volume is quite up to the high standard set up by the previous ones. This is saying a good deal when it is borne in mind that this volume traverses about the most difficult portion of Sacred Scripture, the Epistles of St. Paul. Like the previous volumes, it abounds in learned introductions and special dissertations. This is the first volume that has appeared since the publication of the Revised New Testament, and it is a little curious to note how far the revised translation here tallies with that which has lately issued from the Jerusalem Chamber. It would certainly be perplexing to the minds of honourable members to find that the two revised translations differed as much from each other as from the old Authorized Version. Perhaps it is the foresight of this difficulty that has prevented the contributors to the present volume from being so liberal as their predecessors in regard to emendations of the old translation. Still it would be easy to point out many important divergencies (e.g., Rom. v. 1; 2 Thess. ii. 7). Without doubt the most valuable contribution to this volume is Mr. Gifford's explanation of the Epistle to the Romans. It is quite worthy to rank with Dr. Westcott's St. John. In treating of the difficult subjects of Justification and Predestination, the learned author is as orthodox as he is profound. We trust that his treatise will do much to disabuse the popular Protestant mind of its Calvinism. The first Epistle to the Corinthians has unhappily fallen into very different hands. Canon Evans may be a good Greek scholar, but he is certainly very poor in exegesis. He is as self-confident of his explanation as if the Epistle was his own, and his style is as declamatory. It is difficult to resist the impression that Canon Evans is an excited homilist, escaped from "The Pulpit Commentary." He says (p. 372), "the whole chapter roars with the context," "St. Paul, in accents of thunder, reiterates the same key-note." He calls the Eternal Word "the Unique Son of God," and his followers, "Christines." Here is a sample of Canon Evans's lively manner. Commenting on 1 Cor. viii. 1, he writes, "We may suppose that starting at the echo of the ominous word 'knowledge' the apostle with mournful or indignant emphasis reiterates it in vehement asyndeton to his amanuensis." "We all possess knowledge

(complacently), knowledge (incisively). What is it worth? How does it work? Knowledge *puffeth up!* whereas charity *buildeth up!*" In another place he accuses a most innocent little pronoun of having "a deep bass of emphatic sarcasm" (p. 286). Occasionally he puts strange language into St. Paul's mouth, *e.g.*, "Both esculents and their assimilating continents are things indifferent, being perishable and not reaching into eternity, and their mutual adaptation shall in time cease" (p. 28). The difficulty created by the phrase "Baptism for the dead," which has puzzled many interpreters, is solved, to Canon Evans's mind, by a little story about an old lady and her crape "for the Duke of Wellington"! Dean Howson, on the Galatians, is a little disappointing, considering his great name as a student of St. Paul. Perhaps one of the most interesting points of this volume is to see how Dr. Alexander, the Protestant Bishop of Derry, deals with "The Man of Sin." The whole weight of Protestant tradition, summed up in Dr. Wordsworth's last pamphlet "Is the Papacy predicted?" is heavy upon him. There is a struggle between his own good sense and the sole *ex cathedra* definition of his Church, proceeding from both Houses of Convocation—"If any man shall affirm that the intolerable pride of the Bishop of Rome, for the time still being, through the advancement of himself by many sleights, stratagems and false miracles, over the Catholic church, the *Temple of God*, as if he were God Himself, doth not argue him plainly to be the man of sin, mentioned by the Apostle, he doth greatly err" (p. 741. note i.). Under these painful circumstances Dr. Alexander can come to no decision as to whether the Pope is Anti-Christ or not. "The church," he says, "will know in time. The revolving light of prophecy will circle round in due season. The line that now seems to waver and to tremble as in water will fix into a definite form" (p. 742). The fear of Dr. Wordsworth and his own gentle flock of Orange lambs makes him add a note, apologising for his half-heartedness, in which he invokes the protection of "one of the very highest name, Archbishop Brownhall," who says that whether the Pope be an Anti-christ, or the Antichrist, or that great Antichrist, "the Protestants determine not, but leave private authors to their own opinions."

Old Testament History of Redemption. Lectures by FRANZ DELITZSCH, Professor of Theology, Leipzig. Translated from MS. Notes by Samuel John Curtiss, Professor in Chicago Theological Seminary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

TO a certain extent we think this little book is scarcely worthy of the great scholar whose name it bears. It is disfigured in many places by a fanciful mysticism, sometimes rabbinical, sometimes Christian, but never really Hebrew, which is always, as we venture to think, the blot on the author's books, and which is often painfully prominent here. Moreover, the best of the ideas which are to be found in this History of Redemption, have been given already in the manual on Messianic Prophecy, which we reviewed some time ago. Still, after making all deductions, the book has high

and special merits of its own, and we are quite sure it will well repay a careful and repeated perusal. We need scarcely add that Dr. Delitzsch writes, not only like a consummate scholar, but also as a Christian, profoundly sincere in his convictions.

By the History of Redemption, Delitzsch means the history of the preparation for the redemption of Christ, as set forth in the pages of the Old Testament. Unfortunately we have not space enough at command to sketch the gradual development, culminating in the "fulness of time," as it is traced in these lectures. But we will select the points, which are discussed with great ability and clearness. First it is shown how the books of Proverbs, Job, and Canticles prepared the Hebrew mind for the reception of a Redeemer come to save all mankind. In these books the particular religion and the special interests of Israel disappear into the background; it is the human heart in the struggle of life, in the darkness of sorrow, in the lyrical joy of pure affection, which is portrayed. In both Proverbs and Job the conception of wisdom, as everybody knows, is specially prominent, so that they are the nearest approach we have in the Hebrew Bible to philosophical discussion, and philosophy is, in its own nature, universal, and not national. Next, Dr. Delitzsch points out with exquisite tact, and great beauty of language, how the types of Christ, like fleeting shadows of the eternal, disappeared one by one, and showed beyond possibility of mistake that they were the shadows, not the substance, the symbols, but not the fulfilment of the Messianic hope. Thus David, in his sufferings, resembles the Messiah; but his very sufferings are associated with the wars which made him a man of blood, and so far unlike the peaceful king who was to come. Solomon was a peaceful king, but he is corrupted, and the kingdom disintegrated, by the effects of peace and prosperity, and once again the eyes of men are compelled to look forward into the mysterious future. Lastly, Dr. Delitzsch seizes the true purpose of the Babylonish exile. Not only did it loosen the bonds and practically enforce the lesson of the prophets, that no sanctity of country or temple would protect the people from the vengeance due to their sins. It did more than this, for, after the exile, the independence of the people was gone never to be restored, except for a brief period under the Maccabees. Israel had ceased to be a state; it became purely a congregation, or church, a unity bound together only by common faith and hope.

But the book has really interested us most because of its incidental remarks. Dr. Delitzsch is, perhaps, one of the most learned men living, a veteran scholar still abreast with the latest literature of the subject to which he has devoted his life. The most recent investigations of Egyptologists, Assyrian inscriptions, &c., are brought to bear on the Old Testament chronology, which is very properly kept constantly in view, and, on a variety of subjects information of extraordinary interest is given in a singularly simple and modest way. We cannot help referring to the section on the drama, or rather, the non-existence of the drama, in purely Semitic literature. (See p. 98.) Job, says Dr. Delitzsch, is almost a drama,

but it is enveloped in the swaddling-bands of history ; the Song of Songs stops short between the dramatic and the lyrical form. The real drama, like the epos, arose among the Indo-Germanic nations, and it only came to the Mahomedans through the Persians after they embraced the religion of Islam.

We have only to add that the translation is evidently the work of a competent scholar. W. F. ADDIS.

The Twit-Twats ; a Christmas Allegorical Story of Birds, connected with the Introduction of Sparrows into the New World. By the Rev.

AUG. J. THÉBAUD, S.J. New York: Catholic Publication Society.

IT is difficult to say why this handsome square book is dull ; but dull it certainly is. Perhaps it is because the narrative of the doings of the birds is so lost and drowned in reflections of no extraordinary brilliancy ; perhaps because the writer tilts against John Stuart Mill ; perhaps it is the puzzling ancient history (of Ireland), through the surf of which we struggle to reach the open sea ; or perhaps because the reader, like the boys at page 77, finds a good deal of the language "as hard as Hebrew." The Twit-Twats are two sparrows, who emigrate from New Ross, under the protection of William O'Murphy, son of Murtough O'Murphy, and settle in Troy City, where, amid various vicissitudes, they become the parents of a numerous race. The book is concerned with their settlement, sufferings, wars, and final victory. It is full of minute and interesting observation and knowledge of bird-life ; but it is spoilt by being made an allegory ; and the prevalent superstition, that Christmas books must describe Christmas time, has seduced the author into dragging in two useless and superfluous Christmas Days. Here is a good specimen of the writer's observation and style :—

The two birds, not losing a moment's time (for April was already on the wane, and all the other pairs were ahead of them), pounced upon everything they could find in the street, and brought to the spot they had chosen either long strings of hay and straw that had fallen from farmers' carts, or narrow strips of blue, red, or white paper, carried by the wind from the houses, and scattered without order in all directions. There could not, indeed, be observed in their work the same regularity as in the nest of the European goldfinch, or, better still, in that of the Baltimore oriole. The sparrows, as was said, are wretched architects, and make very poor weavers. They answer among birds to the race of troglodytes among men, who, according to modern ethnologists, lived originally in caves before our species had the skill of inventing dwellings of wood or stone. I must again repeat, that when the sparrows cannot possibly find any hole or natural recess in walls or rocks, they are compelled to roughly build in the branches of trees ugly apologies for nests, which have nothing in common with the airy constructions of chaffinches or blackcaps. Their attempts at architecture or weaving result in sorry specimens of unsightly ugliness and absolute deformity. You can see among the green leaves only a shapeless mass, or, rather, an ill-looking heap of incongruous materials, against which the wind will howl and the rain pour in torrents, in order promptly to demolish it, when the stormy season of November arrives (p. 60).

The work is embellished by a large number of full-page woodcuts, finished with the clearness and perfection in which the Americans so much excel us, but without imagination or humour.

Leaves from the Annals of the Sisters of Mercy. In Three Volumes. I. Ireland. II. England, Scotland, and the Colonies. III. America. Vol. I. Ireland. New York: Catholic Publication Society. 1881.

THE foundress of the Order of Sister of Mercy was—as few Catholic readers need to be told—the saintly Catherine McAuley. And as the title-page of this volume reminds us, her children are spread far beyond the country of their origin. They have homes in Canada and in the United States, in Africa and in Australia. The writer of these “Leaves,” herself a Sister of Mercy in New Orleans, dedicates her pages to her Sisters “in every land.” There is at this moment a total, she tells us, of no fewer than four hundred and twenty-eight convents of her Institute in all parts of the world, and one hundred and sixty-eight of them are in Ireland, with which this volume deals. Yet the birthday of the order dates only so far back as December 12, 1831, on which day Mother McAuley made her profession, where she had made her novitiate, in the Presentation Convent of George’s Hill, Dublin. The twelfth of December of this year, 1881, is consequently the Jubilee Anniversary of that event, and these volumes of “Leaves” are designed by their authoress as an accompaniment to the universal commemoration of that Jubilee.

The figures we have quoted are alone a wonderful testimony that there was a wide-spread call for Christian mercy and good-doing, and that Mother McAuley and her children have largely met it. Four hundred and twenty-eight houses founded in fifty years gives an average of nearly nine convents every year during that long period; and conjecturing—in the absence of statistics—that there is an average community of five members to each home, there are over two thousand ladies devoted to a hard life of self-sacrifice under this one rule! And all these results had their beginning with the wonderfully gifted, energetic, and devoted woman who, as a child lost her Catholic parents, struggled for her very name of Catholic against the Protestant relatives who adopted her and hated her religion, who, deprived of Mass and Catholic books, gave herself devotedly to the works of mercy and charity that lay within her reach, and who, by force of prayer and fidelity to grace, ended at length by converting her relatives and founding the Order of Mercy without ever dreaming—rather disliking the idea—of becoming a nun.

Her life and the annals of her order are not narrated at length in this volume. The object of the writer has been to select therefrom a few “Leaves,” and we should fancy some of the most interesting ones that refer to the story of the Order in Ireland. She has made a very pleasant book. The story of a “vocation”—the call of a gifted and gentle woman to a severe rule of private life and almost complete devotedness to good-doing for the poor, the stricken, the needy of

every description—is always touching. To read the repetition of this through fifty years, till in Ireland alone the one house of Baggot Street had multiplied itself more than a hundred and fifty times, and every house was filled with Sisters, in addition to the numbers who have heroically gone abroad to do perhaps a harder work in the distant Colonies, brings the lesson home with new force and impressiveness. The writer's style, too, is racy of the old soil, and her selection of anecdotes very happy. It is a book, therefore, the perusal of which by Catholic girls and women would be beneficial. The mothers and wives and maidens who are to be of the world, but to influence it for good at the peril of intensifying its worldliness and opposition to the spirit of Christ, must possess the spirit, whilst they do not follow the letter of such lives as are here related. For the heroic devotedness of these religious women is only the perfection of a graceful charity that should warm the breast of every good woman.

We shall not lengthen this notice by entering into the details of these lives or of the various Convent foundations; readers will do better to go to the book and enjoy them at first hand, set off with such character sketches as the unique specimen of an old P.P. at Kingstown—quite dramatic in the way his doings baffle prediction, and intensely provoking—or such bits of local colouring as Mother McAuley's trips down the "Grand Canal" to Tullamore, called in those days "doing the Grand." But we cannot resist quoting one extract. It refers to the distrust felt by the poor of Limerick for "the caps," *i.e.*, the postulants who do not yet wear the nun's veil.

Yet not one of these rarely-gifted women (three remarkable postulants in "caps" in the Limerick Convent) could satisfy the poorest visitor that rang the door-bell.

"Couldn't I see one of the ladies, agra? I'd like to tell me throubles an' get a bit of an advice."

A postulant comes forward; and, with every appearance of sympathy, assumes a listening attitude.

"Musha, blessings on yer sweet face, now, but it's a rale nun I'd like to be spakin' to, machree."

"Oh! but we're almost the same, dear. Our Reverend Mother is so busy! We come here to be nuns, and—"

"Ah! there, now, don't be jokin' me, honey. Sure I know ye are kind and good, alanna, but it's the rale nun I'm wantin'. I ax yer pardon, dear child."

"Yes, dear, but you know we—"

"O me darlin'! ye wouldn't do at all. Look at the hair, the brown hair, curlin' under the cap. Couldn't ye bring hither wan of the right wans, with her head under the holy veil, now, ye know, like the pictur' of St. Brigid, glory be to God?"

* * * * *

"I counted seventeen nuns and two old maids in the chapel," said a simple woman recently, as she went forth from a convent celebration. Neither of the "old maids" had seen twenty summers, but both, being postulants, wore "caps" (p. 288).

Science, Prayer, Free Will, and Miracles. An Essay re-printed from the DUBLIN REVIEW, of April, 1867. By WILLIAM GEORGE WARD, Ph.D. London: Burns & Oates. 1881.

WE owe this reprint of a very powerful article a few words of notice, if for no other reason, because, in one portion at least it is closely connected with the paper which Dr. Ward publishes in our present number, "The Philosophy of the Theistic Controversy." In 1867, Dr. Ward, whilst admitting the "uniformity" of nature, argued that such uniformity was no intellectual bar to rational belief in free-will, in prayer, or in miracles. In 1882, he again begins by laying down the principle of uniformity; but he now uses it as a lever to destroy the very foundation of the "phenomenal" philosophy.

The extremely clever illustration (pp. 17, 18), in which he sets before the eyes of the most untrained reader the possibility of a Divine "pre-movement" of all natural causes, is not only clever but conclusive. God *may* move natural sequence, and physical science cannot possibly prove the negative. An intelligent being *may* be at the other end of every chain of cause and effect; and physical phenomena give even greater probability to this view than to the opposite. Dr. Ward's illustration and argument must not be pressed too far. When he has proved the possibility, or probability, of Almighty God's doing, or "pre-moving," everything that happens in nature in a way much more intimate than by that "concurrence" in which all Christian thinkers agree, the much more difficult question remains, how to reconcile God's universal "pre-movement," foreseen, as it must be, from all eternity even to every detail, with the variations which He may be induced to make at the instance of prayer. Not for a moment would we be supposed to imply that Dr. Ward should have gone on to treat such a question as this, in the article now before us. To each question its own opportunity. But it is a distinct gain to science when confusions are cleared away, and when weak twaddle about the uniformity of nature is shown to mean, as far as it has any meaning, an assertion of "necessitarianism" in reference to God Himself. One advantage of driving questions back to first principles is, that as first principles (in moral philosophy) are more easily proved by positive proofs, the objections made against them, even when they cannot be answered, may be more securely disregarded.

The very clear and even popular style of this paper on Free Will and Miracles should induce all who wish for information and argument, or for ready answers to objections, on these subjects, to procure it and have it at hand.

The Catechism of Perseverance. By MONSIGNOR GAUME. (Translated from the 10th French Edition.) Vol. III. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1881.

WE noticed the second volume of this translation in October, 1880, and can speak with similar approval of the third. The present volume is occupied with the history of the Church from the

Day of Pentecost to the beginning of the present century. Considering that this is a large catechism, and not a technical history, the subject is very satisfactorily treated. We are glad to see it in English. The struggles of the Catholic Church against pagan and other royal persecutors, against heresies, and the powers of sin, are here told in an easily read and simple narrative. Such sketches of holy men and women as those of SS. Elzear and his wife Delphina (pp. 497-500), and of St. Elizabeth of Portugal (pp. 500-503), are eminently calculated to produce an excellent effect on the minds of young men and women. We heartily wish the volume a wide circulation; it is just the sort of Church history that ought to be popular, and found amongst the familiar books of a Catholic household.

The Lord's Supper, its Design and the Benefit it confers to the Individual and the Church. A CLERICAL SYMPOSIUM. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1881.

TWELVE Clergymen, of as many varieties of opinion concerning the "design and benefit" of the Lord's Supper, have been asked to unite for the formation of this volume. We have amongst them a Catholic priest and Ministers various—Calvinistic and Lutheran, High Church and Broad Church, and decidedly no-Church, and one contributor whom we should, but for his place here, have fancied could be neither minister nor any sort of Christian. Each of these has contributed a paper stating his belief—sometimes stating rather what he does not believe. The papers originally appeared in the *Homiletical Quarterly*, and each writer could peruse the previous contributions; hence the papers grow more negative and polemical as we proceed. Starting from different principles, interpreting the Sacred Texts by sentiment, and measuring Divine institutions by private judgment—there is the widest divergence of results in the various papers; and no manifestation anywhere of a suspicion that the writer may have failed to recognize any part of the objective divinely-intended truth. And, still, considering the quality of our times we can welcome the appearance in such a volume as this of a Catholic contributor. It is a great advantage, we are of opinion, that many of the men who supplied the other papers should have had to read—and read attentively enough to reply to it—that by Dr. W. Smith of Edinburgh: it is a great advantage too, that a certain number of non-Catholic readers, who would keep devoutly distant from any professedly Catholic book on the Eucharist, will be led to the perusal of this lucid exposition of Catholic belief. It is pleasing to note that the contributors who follow Dr. Smith—and who decidedly have no leaning to Popery—acknowledge the ability and learning shown in his presentation of Catholic doctrine. Indeed, we are glad to add that to our judgment a more consecutive, clear and complete exposition could scarcely—in the narrow space—have been penned. We commend it to Catholic students as a model of doctrinal exposition in modern dress and

living language. It is pleasant to read a paper in which the graces of composition and the tokens of scholarship are as manifest as anywhere in the book; where the learned priest recognizes the standpoint of opponents, and shows sufficient appreciation of their sentiments; and where, nevertheless, not one tittle of the complete truth is sacrificed, nor does the familiar Catholic terminology once give way or even falter. Dr. Smith's acquaintance with Oriental languages comes to his aid here; but his application of Old Testament types and chief proofs for the Catholic doctrines of Real Presence and Transubstantiation are sufficiently complete without the help of that less common knowledge. The whole paper, indeed, is one eminently calculated to do good with educated inquirers. Of course Dr. Smith is replied to by others; but the general irenical disposition of these learned clerics does not prevent an occasional blow here and there, and nothing said about Dr. Smith is half so indicative of feeling as the following from the fifth paper by Dr. David Brown:—

I cannot stay here to argue with those in the English Church, commonly known as the Ritualistic party, who contend for the consistency of the sacrificial theory with the Articles of their own Church. I will here only say, Romanism I know, and Protestantism I know, but who are ye? (p. 47).

If Dr. Smith's paper were separated we could recommend it to all our readers—we can, however, say that priests would do well to possess the complete volume; they would here find the present multiform state of opinion among our countrymen, as to this great truth of our Holy Faith, carefully thought out and expressed. To know such opinions is often a first condition to placing Catholic doctrine in the light that will attract the attention of inquirers.
